

Francis Wilford White, Jr.
Robert Richard White
John Adams Wickham, Jr.
Chester Morse Willingham, Jr.
Durward Saunders Wilson, Jr.
Gall Francis Wilson
Patrick Wayne Wilson
Robert Maris Wilson
Rene Arthur Wolf
Francis Rudolph Wondolowski
Stuart Wood, Jr.
Walter Alexander Wood III
James Frederick Workman
Richard Lee Worley
Sidney Thomas Wright
Richard Robert Wyrrough
William Frank Yeoman
Patrick Henry Zabel
Paul Ray Zavit

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are coming unto Thee with many needs and desires. May this be a day of unclouded vision and joyous service.

Inspire us with a clearer understanding and a more wonderful appreciation of the greatness and glory of democracy. May we earnestly proclaim its ideals and principles. May we feel its compelling constraints and believe in the certainty of its ultimate triumph.

Grant that we may be one in spirit with all who are striving courageously and faithfully for the higher good of humanity.

May that day soon dawn when men and nations everywhere shall be members of the kingdom of peace and brotherhood.

Humbly we offer our prayer in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE AMERASIA MATTER

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been doing a little investigating on my own accord of the so-called Amerasia matter, and I am glad and pleased that I have been joined in this by the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Here were the most sensational and astounding conspiracy charges and arrests of the last war. The facts were that deep-secret American military documents had been taken illegally from Government files, much more vital documents than were involved in the recent Hiss-Chambers affair. It is a strange case, and an aroused public is curious. Six people were arrested. Three were indicted. Two paid small fines. The policy advocated by the defendants in these cases became the official American policy in China, and China, for a cen-

tury friendly to America, became a satellite of Soviet Russia. I am today asking the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives to start an investigation of this matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

J. T. MELSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 597) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "liability", insert "if any."

Page 1, line 7, after "recovery", insert "if any."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB BROWN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1024) for the relief of Jacob Brown, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "and interest."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSIE LEE SPENCER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1026) for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALLEN L. SHERWOOD

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Allen L. Sherwood, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,087.50" and insert "\$587.50".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I. D. COSSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2719) for the relief of I. D. Cosson, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$15,000".

Page 2, line 3, after "Provided", insert "That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident: *Provided further*."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NORA JOHNSON

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$504" and insert "\$388.80".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER PIPPIN ET AL.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4164) for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$5,183" and insert "\$15,183".

Page 2, line 3, after "Provided", insert "That such payment to such guardian shall not be made unless such guardian has been authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction to enter into a final settlement, and give a final release in full, of all claims of said minor against the United States by reason of such accident: And provided further."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA AVNER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4720) for the relief of Stella Avner, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "October 16, 1946" and insert "October 13, 1946".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCIDE RAYMOND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 6051, for the relief of Alcide Raymond, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,965.67 to Maud E. Raymond, widow of Alcide Raymond, Army serials No. R-203028, formerly sergeant, Battery A, Thirteenth Coast Artillery, which amount is equivalent to full retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of active-duty pay of a sergeant from November 14, 1936, to and including January 31, 1948, the date of the death of Alcide Raymond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULE PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 5074, DEALING WITH AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 572, Rept. No. 1972), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE HIGH PRICE OF BEEF?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I protest as vicious propaganda and defamation of beef producers in Iowa and elsewhere the following article which appeared in the Washington, D. C., Daily News on April 28 and from which I quote the following:

CHICAGO.—Housewives across the Nation were reported today to be resisting higher and higher prices tagged on beef by butchers.

Analysts blamed the spiraling prices on farmers who held cattle on pasture to force prices up. Choice cuts of beef sold at about 20 cents higher than they did a month ago.

This article collapses at the first sign of a fact.

Practically the same number of cattle were on feed and slaughtered in the comparable period last year.

While beef prices to consumers went up 20 cents a pound, farmers were being paid at Chicago stockyards only about a cent and a half more per pound.

Last Thursday, on the floor of the House, I urged Members of this Congress to smoke out and order the prosecution of those responsible for unconscionable price spreads between farmers and consumers. I said then and I repeat that here is a job that my metropolitan colleagues, whose constituents are being bilked, ought to enjoy sinking their teeth into.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON POST—BROWDER?

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in the proceedings an editorial from the Washington Post of April 28, entitled "Browder's Contempt," which is probably the most incredible editorial in the history of American journalism. It should be reproduced in the form of badges to be worn by Mr. Eugene Meyer, chairman of the board, Mr. Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, and Mr. Herbert Elliston, editor, as a passport which would gain them prompt entrance into any iron-curtain country in the world. Considering the Post's performance on Browder, together with its shameless defense of Alger Hiss, it is a wonder that the Post has any American subscribers left.

MR. BROWDER'S CONTEMPT

If Mr. Earl Browder were a malicious man, he could have paid off a number of old scores in his appearance yesterday before the Tydings subcommittee. Senator HICKENLOOPER asked him to put the finger on a great many persons, some of whom very probably had shared responsibility for ousting him as general secretary of the Communist Party. But, as Mr. Browder put it, he did not intend to allow himself to be degraded to the level of Louis Budenz. And he did not propose to participate in any further extension of guilt by association.

In refusing to identify and stigmatize certain of the persons whose names were presented to him by Senator HICKENLOOPER, Mr. Browder was patently in contempt of the committee's authority. But this contempt was pretty well earned by the drift and character of Senator HICKENLOOPER's questions; and it was by no means discreditable to Mr. Browder. It did not reflect any unwillingness to assist the subcommittee in the discharge of its investigative function; Mr. Browder was as responsive as anyone could have wished to those questions relating directly to the McCarthy charges and to "disloyalty" within the State Department. But, like Mrs. Bella Dodd, who appeared before the subcommittee Tuesday evening, he firmly refused to engage in what might be called for want of a better term the onomatophilia to which Senator HICKENLOOPER appeared to be addicted.

Senators McMAHON and TYDINGS deserve a great deal of credit for bringing the proceedings back into focus and winnowing out of Senator HICKENLOOPER's chaff the questions that Mr. Browder could answer in good conscience and with self-respect. No doubt they saved the witness from a contempt citation. They also saved the subcommittee from engaging in a kind of persecution that might have resulted in its punishing Mr. Browder for adherence to fundamental Amer-

ican decencies. Not everyone in America tests a man's loyalty to his country by his willingness to betray his former friends. The apotheosis of the informer is not yet altogether accomplished in the United States.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MIDWESTERN TOUR

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that our good President is making a little nonpolitical tour through the Midwest, and I wish, when he stops in my district, that he will tell my farmers just why, first of all, he gave the rabbit punch to the dairy farmers by signing the oleomargarine bill and, secondly, why the State Department follows that up with a knock-out blow. According to a news release today the United States will cut tariffs on butter within a month and consider tariff concessions on several hundred other items, and this in spite of the fact that our Commodity Credit Corporation today has nearly 100,000,000 pounds of good butter in storage. I think the proposal to encourage competing imports at this time is ridiculous, and I wish our President would tell my good farmers a little about that when going through my district, the Seventh of Minnesota.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my good friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to the fact that if you want all these things in this country, how far can you go in giving all the people all over the world everything they want? I say it must stop. Do you not think this is pretty near the time when you are going to wreck the American people with spending? We must stop spending and balance our outgo and income. If we want to help the American people, we better begin to help them here at home, and the only way to start is just like the gentleman from Minnesota said a minute ago; stop this administration from taking off the tariff on 2,500 articles and letting the merchandise come in from foreign countries and putting our people out of work, shutting down our industries. You have to do that first. That is one thing. The second thing is, you have to stop going into the red to the tune of \$7,000,000,000 a year, or you are going to wreck our Nation. So, you are on the road to ruin. Now, let us stop that road to ruin and let us get down and get some common sense, and let the American people know pretty soon that they have a Congress that will cut down on our spending. You are laying up a great

debt and expecting your children and children's children to pay the bills that you are leaving unpaid.

I say it is a sin, a sin against your children.

Yes, it is a crime to wreck our Government and that is what debt does, it wrecks anybody, it will wreck any nation if it is carried too far.

A word to the wise is sufficient. Be wise and economize. It is sensible, it is wise, it is sound.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of March the President sent down 21 reorganization plans. The House had a 10-day recess, but all of those plans will become effective unless rejected by either the House or Senate. If any of them are to be rejected, a vote must be taken before the 23d day of May. There are several resolutions which ask for the rejection of some of those plans, perhaps five or six, maybe more. Unless the House begins to consider some of those resolutions soon, the legislation proposed by those plans will become effective by default. It is my purpose, I think beginning tomorrow, to ask that some of those plans be given consideration under the reorganization law.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has conferred with me. He knows what the situation is. I told the gentleman that after the appropriation bill was over I would get into a huddle with him and the chairman of the committee and we would make arrangements about bringing them up. Only yesterday we had a chat about the subject. Am I correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the unanimous-consent order of the House the appropriation bill pending has preference, so we cannot consider anything until after its consideration is completed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me tell the gentleman the answer. The answer is that I discovered this morning that the appropriation bill, in the opinion of one qualified to speak, is going to take all of this week and all of next week. It is physically impossible to take up those resolutions asking for the rejection of those plans and give each one consideration in the remaining time; that is, the time that will remain after the debate on this bill is finished and the 23d of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know; but there is nothing that can be done. The appropriation bill has the right-of-way. I assured the gentleman that when we got to where it was apparent that the con-

sideration of this appropriation bill would be concluded in the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman and I and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] would get together and discuss the matter; that the gentleman from Michigan could take it up with his Republican colleagues on the committee and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] with his Democratic colleagues and arrange for bringing up these various resolutions of disapproval that have been introduced and reported out adversely; so there is nothing more anyone can do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That would be fine and agreeable were it not for the fact that there will not be time enough left to consider them before the 23d of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman cannot criticize anybody for the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not criticizing anybody. I am just seeking relief, asking that the House be permitted to act.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a series of editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial that appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald; also a statement by O. R. Strackbein, chairman, National Labor-Management Council, on foreign trade policy, before the Steed subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances, and in two to include newspaper editorials.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a magazine article.

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter appearing in the Washington Post from the former Undersecretary of State, Mr. Will Clayton.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two articles.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article by Frank C. Wal-drop on communism.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 866) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. ASPINALL objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

GLADYS J. SENYOH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Gladys J. Senyoh.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES APPRAISERS BUILDING, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 794) for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named firms the sums herein specified, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for losses arising out of the performance of contracts or subcontracts in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.: Carthage Marble Co., \$2,902.23; Herman Lawson Co., \$105,286.51; James A. Nelson Co., \$40,892.56; George F. Brayer Co., \$23,910.04; and American Terrazzo Co., \$9,283: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any such claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract

to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "Carthage Marble Company, \$2,902.23."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "\$105,286.51", and insert "\$36,127.93".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "\$40,892.56", and insert "\$27,221.01".

Page 2, line 3, strike out "\$23,910.04", and insert "\$15,044.93".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "\$9,283.00", and insert "\$5,366.40".

Page 2, line 4, strike out the colon, and insert "Plant Rubber & Abestos Works, \$8,502.17; Emil Solve, \$2,483.34; Dohrmann Hotel Supply Company, \$97.30; Mundet Cork & Company, \$7,253.95; S. H. Pomeroy, \$8,128.18; Fire Protection Products Company, \$895.49; Lamson Corporation, \$267.84; Texas Quarries, \$790.84; Frank B. Smith, \$1,509.00; Turner Resilient Floors, Inc., \$4,068.02; D. N. & E. Walter & Company, \$573.93; Phoenix Simpton Company, \$362.13; and Acme Floors, \$115.92."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JUAN ANTONIO RIVERA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5051) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera, the sum of \$10,000; to Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Raul Valle Antelo, the sum of \$10,000; to Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero, the sum of \$10,000; to Mrs. Otto Resse, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Otto Resse, the sum of \$10,000; and to Mrs. Hugo Soria, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Hugo Soria, the sum of \$10,000. Such sums are in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the deaths of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera, Maj. Raul Valle Antelo, Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero, Maj. Otto Resse, and Maj. Hugo Soria, who were killed as the result of an accident in which a C-54 transport plane of the United States Air Force crashed in the Pacific Ocean approximately 1 mile off the Peruvian coast near the town of San Juan, Peru, on September 19, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the payments authorized by this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOURDINE LIVERMORE ESTATE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5151) for the relief of the estate of Lourdine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to the estate of Lourdine Livermore, of Long Beach, Calif., and to pay the sum of \$10,000 to the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas, of Long Beach, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Lourdine Livermore and Dorothy E. Douglas sustained as a result of being shot by Lt. Beaufort G. Swancutt of the United States Army, on March 4, 1944, at Camp Anza, Riverside, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$6,701.62".

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$6,499".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. L. SMELCER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5250) for the relief of J. L. Smelcer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. L. Smelcer, doing business as the Warrensburg Foundry, Midway, Tenn., the sum of \$49,875.42. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said J. L. Smelcer against the United States arising by reason of losses sustained by him when, at the insistence of contract representatives of the Government and officials of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and upon their assurance that he would be reimbursed for any losses occasioned thereby, he entered into the production of base-closing plugs for fragmentation bombs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVAR G. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5972) for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ivar G. Johnson, of Jamestown, N. Y., the sum of \$275. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ivar G. Johnson against the United States on account of property damage sustained by him when his automobile was destroyed in a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps truck which took place on April 19, 1941, on State Highway No. 18 about 2 miles south of Cattaraugus, N. Y.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK, RICHMOND, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6198) for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif., the sum of \$27,039.46, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of a proportionate part of the loss sustained by said bank on a Government-guaranteed loan to R. J. Minton, doing business as R. J. Minton Construction Co.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. L. M. COX AND MRS. M. R. NICKLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6449) for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. L. M. Cox of Pocahontas, Ark., the sum of \$2,000 and to Mrs. M. R. Nickle of Pocahontas, Ark., the sum of \$2,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. L. M. Cox and the said Mrs. M. R. Nickle (widow and daughter,

respectively, of the late F. W. Cox) against the United States arising out of damage done to certain real property owned by the late F. W. Cox and situated near Biggers, Randolph County, Ark., which property was damaged as a result of the construction, in 1942, of Biggers Auxiliary Field: *Provided,* That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$500."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH E. BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6969) for the relief of Ralph E. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,500 to Ralph E. Brown, former private, serial 15086200, United States Air Force, of Adrian, Mich., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the erroneous arrest in Detroit, Mich., on June 3, 1949, and confinement incommunicado at Selfridge Field Air Force Base, Michigan, until June 13, 1949; and payment for the loss of wages as a result of such arrest and confinement: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the word "incommunicado".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARA M. FORTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7278) for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Clara M. Fortner, of 220 West Magnolia Street, Au-

burn, Ala., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Frasier Fortner, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane copiloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HORACE J. FENTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 621) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Horace J. Fenton, formerly an associate professor at the United States Naval Academy, the sum of \$100 per month for the remainder of his life, beginning with the month in which this act is approved, chargeable to such appropriations as may be made for the payment of retirement annuities to civilian members of the teaching staff of the United States Naval Academy and postgraduate schools.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STAVROS MATHEOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4011) for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos and Matheou).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to withhold and suspend further proceedings in the case of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou), who, by an order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, under date of February 21, 1949, is required to depart from the United States without expense to the United States Government, to any country of his choice on or before June 30, 1949, or suffer deportation; and further that the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou) as of October 5, 1926, the date on which he entered the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the country properly chargeable therewith.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 5, page 1, strike out the words "withhold and suspend further" and insert in lieu thereof "cancel".

On page 2, line 9, strike out the words "other than those relating to quotas." and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FERDINANDO SCHIAPPA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ferdinando Schiappa, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 14, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Italian quota of the first year that the same Italian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FRANCESCO DRAGO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4806) for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Francesco Drago, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 19, 1948. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Italian quota of the first year that the same Italian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DAVID MUNSON OSBORNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6505) to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand, shall be considered to have entered the United States for permanent residence on May 17, 1946, at New York.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall deduct one number from the British quota in the current quota year or the first year in which the quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "British", and on line 10, after the word "quota" insert "for New Zealand".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERNARD SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7254) for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Bernard Smith, a native of Burma, who is the wife of Bernard Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa., a citizen of the United States, presently employed by the Isthmian Steamship Co. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws the said Mrs. Bernard Smith shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Co.", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 11 and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JACK B. MEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7283) for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Jack B. Meyer, Japanese wife of Sgt. Jack B. Meyer, and that the said Mrs. Jack B. Meyer may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all of lines 9 and 10 and the words "permanent residence" in line 11, and insert "a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA MARGARITE NOE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7485) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe (nee Wiegmann), German wife of Jesse L. Noe, Jr., master sergeant, United States Army, of Louisville, Ky., a citizen of the United States, insofar as concerns any conviction or admission of the commission of a crime by her of which the Department of Justice and the Depart-

ment of State have knowledge on the date of enactment hereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID GEORGE CALLAWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7656) for the relief of David George Callaway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien David George Callaway, who is the adopted child of George Denton Callaway and Margaret Katharine Callaway, husband and wife, and who are native-born American citizens, shall be deemed to be the natural-born child of said George Denton Callaway and Margaret Katharine Callaway.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, David George Callaway shall be considered the alien natural-born child of his adoptive parents, Major and Mrs. George Denton Callaway, United States citizens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIE GAM YEAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7050) for the relief of Louie Gam Yean.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Louie Gam Yean, born on July 13, 1948, the son of Louie Do Jum, who is a resident of Butte, Mont., if he is found by the United States Consul to whom application for visa is made, to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the annual quota limitations.

SEC. 2. Upon the admission of Louie Gam Yean to the United States the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Chinese persons for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Louie Gam Yean, minor child of Louie Do Jum, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGUSTIN CORTES MARTINEZ ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3169) for the relief of Agustin Cortes Martinez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, his

children, Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustín Cortes Diaz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Agustín Cortes Martínez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, his children, Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustín Cortes Diaz, of San Juan, P. R., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on September 4, 1946, the date of their actual entry into the island of Puerto Rico, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct five numbers from the quota for Spain for the first year that said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain Spanish physicians and their immediate families, to wit, Agustín Cortes Martínez, his wife, Guillermina Diaz de Cortes, and his children Santiago Cortes Diaz, Agustina Guillermina Cortes Diaz, and Guillermo Agustín Cortes Diaz; Victor Cuquerella; Rafael Troyano de los Rios; Jose A. Garcia Galarza, and his wife, Maria Sobrino Perez de Garcia Galarza; Ruperto Varela Canosa, his wife, Maria del Carmen Menendez de Varela Canosa, and his sons, Ivan Ruperto Varela Menendez, and Igor Felix Varela Menendez; Jose Vasquez San Martin, and his wife, Maria de los Angeles Crespo de Vasquez San Martin; and Francisco Colchero Arrubarrena; as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall, if the alien was a quota immigrant at the time of entry, instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each such alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country of the first year that such quotas are available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY MITSUYE NISHIHAMA YABE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6169) for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of law which make ineligible for permanent residence persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mary Mitsuye Nishi-

hama, now Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe, who is the legal wife of Donald T. Yabe, a United States citizen, as of June 26, 1949, at which time she was temporarily admitted into the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission into the United States persons who are racially ineligible to citizenship, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe, the wife of Donald Takeichi, first lieutenant, United States Army, and a citizen of the United States, as of June 26, 1949, the date on which she entered the United States temporarily."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FUJIKO CHICHIE IMBERT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6652) for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of the law excluding from admission to the United States persons of a race ineligible to citizenship Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, Japanese wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., Japanese son by birth, of Robert Imbert, a citizen of the United States and a soldier in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if they are otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert and child, respectively, to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That in the administration of the immigration laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert and Robert Imbert, Jr., the wife and child, respectively, of Sergeant Robert Raymond Imbert, a citizen of the United States, presently serving with the United States Armed Forces."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZUKO MIYAMA AKANA AND CHANG KING AKANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7065) for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana, wife and son of Tai Honk Akana, a citizen of the United States and presently serving in Japan as a civilian employee with the United States Army, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "Army", change the comma to a period and strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETSUOKO AMANO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7066) for the relief of Setsuko Amano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Setsuko Amano, native of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Setsuko Amano, the Japanese fiancée of Thomas A. Takasue, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that the said Setsuko Amano may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ETHEL N. PLUNKETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 702) for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum

of \$35,000, to Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett, of Harts-ville, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of an operation at the station hospital, Huntsville Arsenal, Alabama, on February 18, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim; and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLIE SYLVESTER CORRELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2464) for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charlie Sylvester Correll, the sum of \$22,106.10, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for time lost from work, medical, and other expenses incident thereto, sustained on or about the 14th of February 1943, as a result of a collision on Highway 466 approximately 23 miles northwest of Barstow, Calif., between the automobile in which he was riding and an Army transport truck owned by the United States Government, said truck was transporting an airplane: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$22,106.10" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,107".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSÉ SALGADO SANTOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3305) for the relief of the estate of José Salgado Santos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to the administrator of the estate of the late José Salgado Santos, who was killed on Au-

gust 17, 1943, when struck in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, by a Government truck operated by a project employee on the work-relief program in Puerto Rico under the Federal Works Agency. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIK H. LINDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3675) for the relief of Erik H. Lindman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Erik H. Lindman, warrant officer, retired, United States Coast Guard, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any of the compensation paid to him as a civilian employee of the War Department during the period beginning on March 23, 1942, and ending on May 1, 1945, both dates inclusive. The Comptroller General has ruled that \$14,069.89 so paid Warrant Officer Lindman was paid in contravention of section 2 of the Appropriation Act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 62), although Warrant Officer Lindman was advised by a Coast Guard officer before accepting such employment that his receipt of such compensation would not be in contravention of such section, and the Comptroller General has recognized "that such employment was due solely to the erroneous construction placed upon the controlling statutes by the administrative office."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Erik H. Lindman, the sum of \$4,447.01. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Erik H. Lindman against the United States for retired pay for the period beginning on August 1, 1942, and ending on January 31, 1945, both dates inclusive. Although such sum is due and unpaid, the Comptroller General has ruled that such sum should be applied in partial liquidation of the indebtedness asserted under the act referred to in the first section: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED TRANSFORMER CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6489) for the relief of the United Transformer Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the United Transformer Corp., of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$136,135.72, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation from the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co., of New York, N. Y., for war material shipped to the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co. at the direction and request of the Signal Corps, Department of War, the Signal Corps having failed to notify the United Transformer Corp. of the cessation of advance payments to the Horni Signal Manufacturing Co. prior to the shipment of war material for which claim is made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$10,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$136,135.72", and insert "\$4,458".

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Corp.", and insert "Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINENTAL INSURANCE CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6053) for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$12,000 to the Continental Insurance Co., to pay the sum of \$18,000 to Federal Insurance Co., and to pay the sum of \$12,500 to National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained to the residence of Mrs. Ruth T. Weeks, of New Canaan, Conn., as a result of an accident involving a United States Army airplane of the Connecticut Interceptor Command which struck the dwelling on October 12, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IVAN E. TOWNSEND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5639) for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ivan E. Townsend, Muscoda, Wis., the sum of \$1,500. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ivan E. Townsend against the United States arising out of his improper arrest and detention by Army authorities in 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRA D. DOYAL AND CLYDE DOYAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5150) for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal, both of Long Beach, Calif., the sum of \$5,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ira D. Doyal and the said Clyde Doyal against the United States on account of the loss on February 24, 1942, of their fishing vessel *Tennessee*, when such vessel, while in a disabled condition, was cut adrift in a rising storm by United States Coast Guard vessel No. 411: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN G. ESSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4628) for the relief of John G. Essenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,-

000 to John G. Essenberg, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army truck bearing New York license No. 422991 owned by Camp Shanks at Miller Highway and Fifty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., on March 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000".

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Essenberg" insert "of 453 Sixty-eighth Street, Brooklyn, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIRO TAKEMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4371) for the relief of Shiro Takemura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Shiro Takemura, of the county of Los Angeles, city of Los Angeles, State of California, the sum of \$5,000, in settlement of all claims against the United States on the part of all heirs at law, payable to the said Shiro Takemura, as the head of the family, on account of the death on April 23, 1943, and funeral expenses of Paul Toshio Takemura, a minor, as a result of the failure of the officials in charge of the Granada Relocation Center, Amache, Colo., to provide necessary safeguards for danger zones, in said center: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not to exceed \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. C. S. WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4163) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker, Ogilby, Imperial County, Calif., the sum of \$11,322.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker against

the United States for destruction of personal and real property during a period of more than 18 months beginning February 1943, caused by operations of several units of the United States Army while those forces were stationed between El Centro, Calif., and Yuma, Ariz.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$11,322.50" and insert "\$2,252.50".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN D. LANGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3994) for the relief of John D. Lange.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John D. Lange, the sum of \$153, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States as a result of an erroneous payment by the Alien Property Bureau out of trust account No. 29066.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Lange", insert ", of 492 East Seventy-fourth Street, New York, N. Y."

At the end of bill add: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KOTO KOGAMI KITSU AND JEANNETTE AKEMI KITSU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7073) for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu, natives of Japan, the wife and daughter of Stanley Y. Kitsu, a citizen of the United States and presently serving in the armed forces of the United States, and that,

if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the words "United States", change the comma to a period and strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOBUKO MAEDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7199) for the relief of Nobuko Maeda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Nobuko Maeda, of Sapporo, Hokkaido, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of First Lieutenant George N. Asai, a citizen of the United States on active duty with the United States armed forces, and that Nobuko Maeda may be eligible for a visa as a nonquota immigrant provided the marriage between the above-named parties occurs within six months after the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Nobuko Maeda, the Japanese fiancée of First Lieutenant George N. Asai, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Nobuko Maeda may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within three months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIO LOUIS TOMITA AND FUMIKO TOMITA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7292) for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. WILLARD THULIN (FORMERLY JUTTA MAINKE)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7362) for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Mainke).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States aliens who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Mainke), the wife of Willard Thulin, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Mainke" and insert "Kono".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZUKO TAKANASHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7416) for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Suzuko Takanashi, the Japanese fiancée of Sergeant Paul J. Klefer, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Suzuko Takanashi may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment date of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Sergeant".

Page 1, line 7, after "United States" insert the following: "presently serving with the United States armed forces".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELLEN KNAUFF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7614) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings, and to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, if any, issued in the case of Mrs. Ellen Knauff. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Ellen Knauff shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation pro-

ceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

Sec. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Ellen Knauff shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, strike out the word "deportation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "exclusion"; and in the same line after the word "proceedings" insert "under 22 U. S. C. 223 and 8 C. F. R. 175.53, 175.57".

On page 1, line 5, strike out the words "and warrant" and substitute the word "exclusion" for the word "deportation".

On page 1, line 8, after the words "subject to", insert the words "exclusion or".

On page 1, line 10, strike out the word "deportation"; substitute the word "warrant" for the word "warrants".

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "as of the date of her last entry into" and insert in lieu thereof the word "in".

On page 2, line 5, after the word "States", insert "as of August 14, 1948".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AKIKO OSADA GUSTAFSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7682) for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson, Japanese wife of William Albert Gustafson, a natural-born United States citizen and an honorably discharged World War II veteran who is serving in Japan in a civilian status with the armed forces of the United States. The said Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson shall, upon application hereafter filed, be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 11, and page 2, strike out lines 1 to 3 inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MITSUKO ITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7653) for the relief of Mitsuko Ito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Mitsuko Ito, the Japanese fiancée of Corp. Thomas Stafford Radtke, a citizen of the United States and a member of the United States armed services, and that Mitsuko Ito may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visi-

tor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Mitsuko Ito is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Corp. Thomas Stafford Radtke, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsuko Ito, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Mitsuko Ito, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Mitsuko Ito as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUZUKO YAGI AND ANNE YAGI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7363) for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which exclude from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi, natives of Japan, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, they shall be granted admission into the United States as nonquota immigrants for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONMOUTH CONSOLIDATED WATER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7708) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, for and on behalf of the United States, to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co., Long Branch, N. J., its successors and assigns, on such terms and conditions as he determines to be in the public interest, easements, and rights-of-way for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a water tower, together with necessary pipe lines and other appurtenant facilities, at such place or places within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J., as may be approved by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROLINE M. NEWMARK AND MELVILLE MORITZ

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for im-

mediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 744, the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their father, Commander Albert Moritz, United States Navy, retired, who died as the result of injuries sustained in a fall at the Brooklyn naval hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y., on January 15, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER 10. DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on chapter 10 is now in order, not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary inquiry that I desire to submit is, When will it be in order to

make points of order on chapter 10? Can that be done now, under the agreement that was reached in the committee the other day, or can it be done when the chapter is being read for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. When the chapter is read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity of conveying to the House, as vice chairman of this committee, that it is my privilege to carry the bill for the balance of the afternoon because our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], is away taking care of official business. He will be back in Washington late this evening, and will take over the responsibilities of the committee chairmanship tomorrow.

As you undoubtedly know from previous statements that have been made by members of the committee, we held rather extensive hearings on this measure, starting on January 9 and ending on April 27, which was some 3 months plus.

May I express my personal appreciation to my colleagues on the committee. We have worked together very harmoniously over a long period of years. It certainly is a very pleasant feature for one to enjoy when dealing with problems of the magnitude presented in a bill of this character.

I also want to thank our executive committee secretary, Mr. Lambert, and Larry Miller, his assistant. They have done a remarkable job in cooperation with the members of the committee. We are all most appreciative of the fine efforts they have always extended.

We have gone into the various and sundry aspects of this bill most exhaustively, and have submitted to the whole committee and to the House the results of our efforts.

May I call attention to some parallels that prevail and that are indicated in the final totals of the respective bills of a year ago and as of the present. For example, the appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 were \$13,000,000,000 plus. At that time there was a reduction on the part of the committee of \$230,221,000. The budget for the fiscal year 1951 was \$13,028,675,000, and the reduction made by the committee was \$203,332,700. In other words, the totals here give evidence of the consistent manner in which the committee has surveyed the presentations that were made to it and of the carefully considered reductions because of the general international picture that you all know prevails.

I think, in general, if I have any adverse comments to make about the bill, it is because I am concerned over the international aspects as they presently prevail. I am sometimes confronted with the thought, Are we doing as much as we ought to do in providing our military forces with adequate and advanced matériel of all types and characters in order that we may preserve the integrity of our form of government and our way of living?

Today our national security is in constant danger. If we act intelligently, as

I believe we will, we will approach the problems of our national defense with a great deal of concern and sympathetic understanding. I realize, as we all do, there is a limit to the capacity of the economy of our Nation to provide funds for any operation in the governmental departments. But, at the same time, it does seem to me, in the search for economy we would do well to scrutinize expenditures, for example subsidies, and various and sundry other governmental operations and make our reductions there so that we may preserve an adequate military establishment for the defense of our Nation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely right in his last statement. I think above all the Congress should seriously consider cutting down on those other items wherever we can cut, always with a view to having ample funds for our military establishment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman has always been a very able representative in this body and is always greatly concerned in matters having to do with the welfare of the country and the safety of the country.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not get the total amount for the armed services. Was it \$13,500,000,000?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The request from the budget was \$13,028,675,000. The report of the subcommittee which was submitted to the entire Committee on Appropriations was \$12,825,342,300, which reflected a reduction of \$203,332,700.

Mr. STEFAN. Does it include the additional \$350,000,000 voted by the full committee a few days ago?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not. I am coming to that later in my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Does it also include contract authorizations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It does not. I am coming to that later in my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman going to come to the full amount?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. My figures are approximately \$15,000,000,000, including contract authorization for armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I will come to that in the final part of my statement.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will permit, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, with a \$15,000,000,000 budget for the armed services, with \$1,000,000,000 for atomic energy and stock piling, and \$6,000,000,000 for the Veteran's Administration and \$6,000,000,000 for interest on the public debt, with \$3,000,000,000 for the Marshall plan, if those are to be fixed items, you do not have very much to work on and it would only leave about ten or eleven billion dollars left to carry on the remaining functions of the Government.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course, it depends upon the point of view one takes as to what is first and what must come first. I think we have reached the stage, may I say to the gentleman very frankly, where we will have to draw very sharp lines of demarcation in our expenditures. In other words, if we have a dollar, to wit, 100 cents, and naturally we have to subdivide that into certain categories of expenditure, we have to draw the line some place as to what should have priority.

Mr. STEFAN. The expenditures are going to be around \$42,000,000,000 and the receipts are going to be between thirty-seven and thirty-eight billion dollars. If \$31,000,000,000 are for fixed items, how much will you have left to run the rest of the Government with? Cannot we make some real reductions without hurting necessary functions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will admit the proportions are not too generous.

Mr. STEFAN. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But perhaps in those places where we are not bound by the mandate of law we can make further reductions than we have been making.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will agree with me that with this disparity between receipts and expenditures, with the deficit, and with only about \$11,000,000,000 left to cover the expenditures of the other functions of the Government, there is no possibility of balancing the budget or paying on the public debt, is there?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It depends on the attitude.

Mr. STEFAN. There have been further suggestions that the national defense items can be cut where that can be done with safety. I understand the Secretary is asking the other body to restore that \$203,000,000 which your committee has cut already. I am for all needed for defense, but I am worried about national bankruptcy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that is what the Secretary of Defense is going to do.

Mr. STEFAN. That will amount to a half-billion-dollar increase in the bill for the armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the gentleman is premising his remarks on whether we are going to balance the budget this year, my answer is emphatically and automatically "No"—not at the present rate that we are appropriating funds. That is the point I am trying to make and that is what I am expressing my opinion on.

It comes down to the question: If we are going to balance the budget, where are we going to make the cuts? Personally, I feel that I have supported reductions in our military functions as far as it is reasonably safe to do so. I even questioned this figure. The reductions have to be made some place else. Recently the Post Office Department curtailed some of its service. I do not know what your mail indicated, but I am getting more complaints about not having five deliveries a day than anything else. Furthermore, it might

be advisable for a lot of the people back home who are recommending a balanced budget to quit asking Uncle Sam to function as a Christmas tree and to be a little self-sufficient themselves. It all depends on whose ox is gored. You cannot have your cake and eat it, too. That policy or procedure, economically or otherwise, just cannot prevail.

So that the discussion we have in mind today, as far as I am concerned, at the moment is whether or not your committee is presenting to you a bill in respect to its application to the defense program of this country that should be acceptable to the Members of the House of Representatives and to the other branch of Government as well. I sincerely trust it will be acceptable, because, frankly, I think the external hazards are far greater today than they have been before. If for some reason we were to have to go through another war, and the good Lord forbid that possibility, I do not think we will ever have the time again to prepare ourselves that we have had in the past, and I do not think we will experience any kindly considerations or preknowledge. It all depends on what you and I, as representatives of the people, and the people themselves want to do about writing a life-insurance premium to protect the continuity of our form of government. The determination has to be made by the public and by its representatives in Congress. I feel that the bill we are presenting today is a just one. I question whether it is enough or not, but nevertheless I am happy to go along with the judgment of the committee, both in the subcommittee aspect and in the committee as a whole.

On April 26 the Secretary of Defense reappeared before our subcommittee and requested additional funds. He made a considerable statement on the record and a considerable statement off the record relative to the reasons for the request. But I can say to you Members of the House that he presented to our committee what, in our opinion, were justifications for the added request up to a point. Resulting from his request, the Navy originally had \$475,000,000 in its contract authority aspect. Under the request of the Secretary of Defense, the subcommittee presented to the whole committee, and, in turn, we are going to present it later, in the form of amendments to the bill, to this committee, of an additional \$100,000,000, which will make the total in that respect \$575,000,000. For contract authority for the Air Force there was originally \$610,000,000. The Secretary of Defense asked for \$2,000,000 more. That will be presented in the form of an amendment when we reach that portion of the bill. That makes a total of contract authority of \$1,385,000,000.

He also asked for \$50,000,000 in cash, of which the major portion was to go for submarine activities.

When the bill is in total, if the amendments are accepted by the membership that will be presented by the committee, it will resolve itself into a total of

\$14,255,000,000, cash and contract authority.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that now the Secretary of the Navy is asking for most of the program that Admiral Denfeld asked for before he was removed as Chief of Naval Operations? In reading the press and in asking questions, I have discovered that many of the things he asked for but were refused—I do not mean by Congress but by the Department of Defense—are now being asked for. So his removal really resulted in securing some of the things he tried to get when he was Chief of Naval Operations?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In answer to the gentleman's question, of course I do not feel that I am qualified to enter into the minds of certain personalities or military positions of authority. I will say, however, that the concepts as expressed by Admiral Denfeld during his tenure in office, and as is presently being considered by the commander who occupies the same position Admiral Denfeld did, are so close that it would be very difficult to draw a line of demarcation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So the sacrifice was not in vain, although it was unfortunate.

I wish to state the very high regard I have for the gentleman from California and my appreciation of the fight he has made for naval appropriations. Had it not been for him we would have had a very different picture in our naval defense. The gentleman from California is a magnificent fighter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for her complimentary remarks.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. From my many years' contact with the gentleman from California I consider him one of the ablest Members of the House.

I believe the gentleman from Nebraska was laboring under the assumption that it was impossible to cut our \$42,000,000,000 budget below the point specified. My line of approach would be to take \$1,000,000,000 at least from ECA appropriations and perhaps liquidate what is left of \$1,450,000,000 appropriation for the rearming of western Europe. We can do without those things but we cannot gamble with our own personal defense. That is my personal position.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for expressing his personal views. The gentleman is very gracious in his remarks about me. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

I feel very strongly about this issue, I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota. Very candidly, I have told the people in my congressional district, and in my State of California, that I realize that our national economy is capable of withstanding only a certain amount of expenditure of funds, that somewhere we have got to tighten up our belt if we are going to have adequate military

protection to preserve our form of government. I have admonished them, requested them, and told them, insofar as I was concerned, that much as we need flood control, much as we need reclamation and sundry other things in the West, these matters can be put in a stage of gestation, if I may use the term, for 5 or 10 years, if need be, in order to maintain and preserve our form of government. I am making very strenuous recommendations. I hope my fears and concern may ultimately prove erroneous; I would be very happy if that should result. In the meantime, however, the international situation is so clearly indicated as being hazardous that we cannot afford to jeopardize our defenses or the security of our people.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services I said:

The effectiveness of the economies proposed by the Secretary of Defense Johnson are comparable to those accomplished by the man who cut his wife's throat to stop her nosebleed.

I have not changed my mind, and subsequent events have corroborated my statements.

Despite the changes made in the bill as it is now proposed to be amended, I have preferred to make the speech for the RECORD which I prepared as of the date the Committee on Appropriations approved the report of the Subcommittee on Armed Services, since in substance it is all apropos.

When the committee said that the country could not "safely make further reductions in the military program" and that, on the contrary, it felt that "there is ample warrant for a number of increases in the budget to more adequately prepare this country for an emergency—undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared," it spoke whereof it knew.

I have not changed my mind. The truth is that the proposals of the Secretary of Defense, made, I am afraid, for publicity purposes, in an undertaking to make an alleged saving of \$25,000,000 by abandoning several hospitals, thereby involving an irretrievable loss in money, in readiness of the armed forces, and in services to be rendered to the veterans and dependents of servicemen, have had all the hot air let out of them and have been proven in fact to be no savings at all.

I am sorry to say that this is the rule of thumb—that is, "hog-wash"—to be applied to very many of the alleged savings propositions announced by the Secretary of Defense.

For instance, his dictatorial impounding of \$357,000,000 in funds specifically appropriated by Congress, duly authorized with practical unanimity of purpose and intended to be used in the construction of Navy and Air Force airplanes, evidences no savings. Neither does the \$736,000,000 more, impounded unconsti-

tutionally by the President on Johnson's recommendation, which funds were to raise the Air Force from 48 to 58 groups. These events make it evident that in his zeal for an economy record, Johnson is impairing the national defense. Of course, it is an open secret that he has high political aspirations. The time loss in our readiness program sustained by reason of such action by Johnson has immeasurably weakened our national security. He has deprived us of strength increases which should be in being as of now—increases which are more obviously needed today than ever before in time of peace. The loss of opportunity to construct these planes which were properly authorized and money properly appropriated therefor by the Congress is a measure of the shortsightedness of Johnson's highly publicized program of alleged savings, most of which in the end are in fact no savings but reductions that may ultimately cost us in lives and treasure, unmeasurable.

THE "BIG CARRIER"

There is, moreover, no doubt that eventually we absolutely must have the Navy's big carrier—the 65,000-ton U. S. S. *United States*—as a movable base in Alaskan waters and elsewhere if ever war comes. And I charge the Secretary of Defense with gross negligence, with unwarranted assumption of dictatorial authority, with contempt of Congress, for having so arbitrarily stopped its construction. This action, militarily and economically unsound, was in my opinion unjustified and unwarranted and unauthorized, and it will cost us heavily in the future.

Can it be that we have forgotten the Constitution of the United States because it has so often of late been disregarded? It imposes upon the Congress the obligation of providing for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. Have we forgotten that any act of Congress which undertakes to grant to the Executive Branch of the Government any of the nondelegable powers or authorities of the Congress is unconstitutional?

Have we forgotten that any action taken by any person, from the President down, in contravention of the Constitution, despite any legislation which Congress may have enacted, per se, is void and of no effect?

ILLEGAL USURPATION

I defy anybody to dispute the logical conclusion which must be drawn from these premises which are fundamental despite the intentional usurpation by the executive branch of legislative authority. There must be a reassertion of authority by the Congress. The Congress must preserve its rights. It must protect its prerogatives. They must not be so easily and insultingly disregarded. If legislation be necessary to insure compliance with the will of Congress, and I believe it is, in view of the actions of the Secretary of Defense, it should be promptly enacted to that end.

If we are not to live under a dictatorship in disregard of the Constitution and the prerogatives of Congress, it is high

time Congress realized what has happened recently in the Department of Defense, as evidenced by the usurpation by the Secretary of Defense of the non-delegable functions of Congress.

At the first appearance of the Secretary of Defense before the Subcommittee for the Armed Service, I said, as appears on page 52 of the hearings:

Mr. PLUMLEY. I want the Secretary of National Defense to undertake to justify the usurpation of the prerogative and responsibilities of Congress as reduced to appropriations definitely stating the purpose for which the money is to be used.

On page 61 of the hearings the following colloquy appears of record:

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate and renew the statement that I previously made.

I want the Secretary of Defense to undertake to justify the usurpation by the executive department of the prerogatives and responsibilities of Congress as reduced to appropriations definitely made, stating and limiting the purposes for which the moneys appropriated by Congress are to be used. I want an answer. I do not want an avoidance and evasion; I want a justification of the action taken by the executive department in violation of the rights and prerogatives of Congress. I want to know how to justify it. I am going to know before I get through.

Secretary JOHNSON. I can only repeat what I said before.

The following information was supplied after the hearing:

I think his powers are inherently constitutional, both as Chief Executive and Commander in Chief. The Budget and Accounting Act, or the Apportionment Act, which Colonel Moore mentioned, may be pertinent. Similarly, the war powers may have some bearing, but I am not sure of this at the moment. But whatever is provided in any statute, in my opinion, the source of the President's power is in the Constitution.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I do not want you to repeat what you said before, with all due deference. I want you to answer my question, which you have not done.

Secretary JOHNSON. I think I have.

Mr. PLUMLEY. All right. We differ very diametrically.

Secretary JOHNSON. I realize that we differ, but I think that I have answered it.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Not to the satisfaction of this committee, if you want to know.

Secretary JOHNSON. So I understand, but I am sorry about that. I have given you my honest belief, and I can only repeat that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Do you want to tell me that when the President signs a bill which becomes a law, which he had an opportunity to veto but did not, he can look over a record of the votes of the several Congresses and say, "Well, I just guess they did not mean what they said, and I will do so and so against the expressed will of the representatives of the people of the United States." Do you wish to stand on that?

Secretary JOHNSON. I did not say that.

Mr. PLUMLEY. You substantially said that.

Secretary JOHNSON. But the difference between my saying that and substantially saying it is a keen difference. I stand on what I said.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I think you should not try to equivocate and avoid.

Secretary JOHNSON. We are not equivocating or avoiding and quibbling. We are being frank about what we believe.

The questions were never answered to my satisfaction. Neither did the attempted, evasive answers satisfy many other Members of Congress, though the

questions are of such basic importance that they should be answered flatly and without equivocation.

A CLEAR WARNING

In reporting out the bill now under consideration, the Appropriations Committee sounded a clear warning which, in my opinion, the House—and the Nation—cannot ignore. The committee stated that the country "cannot safely make further reductions in the military program;" and that, on the contrary, "the committee feels that there is ample warrant for a number of increases in the budget to more adequately prepare this country for an emergency—undoubtedly we are taking certain very grave risks in not being better prepared."

These risks are being taken, the committee informs us, because the necessity for economy and financial stability. No one feels more strongly than I do that economy and financial stability are essential if this country is to survive, and I want to say right now that I am delighted to see this idea beginning to take root in the minds of the Democratic Members of the House. It is high time it took root and grew, and high time that positive action in this direction was taken.

But it is an artificial economy that cuts at the basic strength and security of the United States. That kind of false economy will prove very expensive in the long run. The period of time in which we live is one of titanic conflicts and titanic decisions. The fact that these decisions are now going against us shows that we are not measuring up well to the needs of the time. Since last year we have seen the hundreds of millions of good people of China succumb to the leaders of the Communist slave state. Those millions, who should have been won to the ways of free pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, are now lost—temporarily, I hope—as allies to those forces fighting with us for freedom and self-government for peoples and nations throughout the world. Since World War II, Russia's dictatorship has expanded to include influence over 790,000,000 persons—a third of the population of the globe—from previous authority over 193,000,000 persons.

DANGEROUS ASIA

Since last year, the Communist danger to south Asia has increased. Since last year, the world situation has deteriorated very seriously. There are still no treaties on Germany and Austria in sight. Central Europe remains a critical trouble spot in this cold war, the outcome of which is uncertain in many parts of the world. Russia has built an army of 150,000 in eastern Germany. Her military machine has grown enormously. She has just become so confident as to shoot down one of our naval planes. Her people have just seized Hainan, the strategic key to the important island of Formosa. Why then, are we now cutting our military strength? Why then, are we the leaders of the free portions of the world, measuring up like Caspar Milquetoasts to the titanic decisions the times call for? Where is the courage and vision of our great statesmen of the past who measured up well against the

needs of their times? It was the great Theodore Roosevelt who said:

The voice of the weakling or the craven counts for nothing when he clamors for peace; the voice of the just man armed is potent. We need to keep in a condition of preparedness * * * not because we want war, but because we desire to stand with those whose plea for peace is listened to with respectful attention.

PEACE THROUGH POWER OF PREPAREDNESS

If we want peace in our times, we must have the military strength to command the respect of the peoples and nations of the world. This military strength will assure that our diplomacy is listened to, that the great American story of our free institutions and their splendid fruits are heard, and they should be. Our people enjoy a standard of living second to none, because the productivity of our people and their industry is the greatest in the history of the world, because of what our Government and social institutions are.

That our political freedoms, our material aid to people of other nations, our consistent fight over the years for peaceful international relations are no mere gesture, must be made known to the peoples of the world. These facts will not command the respect or attention of the people of the world unless and until we have the military strength to back up our demands for the free flow of the information and exchange of ideas between peoples, to demand the right of nations to self-government, and to compel recognition of the right of all men to be free.

It is a law of physics that nature abhors a vacuum. This law is just as valid when applied to world politics as to physical forces. The Communists, like a boxer looking for weak spots in his opponent's defense, press first in Germany, next in China, then in Korea and south China—wherever they find a military vacuum they move in.

We live in an age when great scientific advances have made close neighbors of nations formerly great time-distances apart. If war comes, it may and almost certainly will come suddenly. The weapons of this scientific age are terrible in their speed and in capacity to inflict stupendous destruction. Planes that travel faster than the speed of sound; atomic bombs that level whole cities in a matter of seconds; listening posts that warn of danger with the speed of light, all have become part of the armaments of nations.

Until such time as we achieve peace in international relations, we must keep our military organization strong enough to meet any eventuality. We must not leave any military vacuum to tempt aggression by the Communist dictators. World War II cost us over \$300,000,000,000. If we keep our military strength adequate until we achieve the peaceful world we all yearn for, we may forestall that great expenditure of manpower and blood and tears and money that military weakness will ultimately cost us.

RELIEF OF AUSTERITY

The armed services submitted an austerity budget to the Congress this year. They requested a cash appropriation of \$13,028,657,000. This budget, which gets

down to the very bone and sinew of your Defense Establishment, represents the minimum requirements—they are, in fact, below minimum—for a nation already accepting grave risks in its security program, as pointed out by the committee report. The Defense Establishment has accomplished more than any agency in reorganizing itself to achieve economy and lower cost of operations, as recommended by the Hoover Commission, even though it has gone so far as to injure our fighting strength. This is well known to you esteemed gentlemen, and to the country at large. The money originally requested was stripped of all fat. It represents the below-minimum amount necessary to provide the combat and operating forces, as well as the back-up support, determined as necessary under this austerity budget. The committee cut this already well-parred budget by \$203,332,700, and in my opinion the committee, in doing that, made a mistake. However, we are now trying to rectify it. What we now have to do is to make that \$200,000,000 available for the Air Force to keep it from going to 42 groups. We should maintain at least the 48 groups the President has called for. And, in addition, some \$380,000,000 should be provided to maintain our declining air power in the Navy. So, in total, this means an increase of \$380,000,000 over the President's budget. Let us not pinch pennies on the cost of security, when the freedom of man throughout the world hangs in the balance.

During the war we set as our goal prosperous economic conditions and employment for 60,000,000 people. We achieved that goal, and our production is at the highest levels in our history. Surely we value our way of life, our freedoms, our high standard of living, our political institutions dearly enough to achieve the minimum goals the Joint Chiefs of Staff say must be met to provide security to those institutions, with a certain degree of calculated risk. Let us not increase the risks further or any more by squeezing the well-pressed security dollars and by failing to keep up our naval and Air Force air strength.

A WONDERFUL TEAM

We have a wonderful team in the United States that will assure us victory in the cold war, and in a shooting war, too, if necessary. If we in Congress treat that team as it should be treated and if—I say “if”—we forbid in the future unconstitutional usurpation of congressional defense authority.

The members of that team, Air Force, Army, Navy, our industrial facilities, and production workers on farm and in factory, represent a winning combination. That combination can meet any future threat of war and crush an enemy if necessary. Let us preserve all the components in that combination in the condition necessary for victory. Right now, it means providing the armed services with the funds necessary to maintain our air power in this air power age.

In conclusion, I quote Stewart Alsop's column entitled “Grandmother's Footsteps”:

MATTER OF FACT (By Stewart Alsop)

GRANDMOTHER'S FOOTSTEPS

In the child's game, called grandmother's footsteps in some infantile circles (and Red light or I spy in others), the “it” stands with his back to a second player while the second player tries to sneak up on him. When the “it” turns his head, the second player freezes in position, looking as innocent as possible. If the second player can tag the “it,” he wins. But if the “it” sees him moving, he loses.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson is now playing the part of the second player in grandmother's footsteps, while the unwary American public plays the “it.” Secretary Johnson is now reversing his position, but so quietly and carefully that he evidently hopes the “it” will not catch him at it.

The latest move in the game was Johnson's request to Congress last week for an increase in aircraft procurement of \$300,000,000, with \$50,000,000 more for antisubmarine work. This move was covered, rather inadequately, to a reasonably sharp-eyed “it,” by Johnson's assertion that certain events had forced a reappraisal, notably the Soviet atomic explosion, the fall of China, the serious situation in southeast Asia.

The meaning of these events has presumably burst with sudden force upon Johnson's consciousness. At least since Johnson assumed office, it has been fairly obvious to anyone capable of reading the newspapers that China was finished and southeast Asia in grave danger. As for the Soviet bomb, the decision drastically to reduce American defenses was confirmed well after it was exploded last September. Only now, 7 months after the event, has it suddenly occurred to Johnson, according to his statement, that the Russian bomb might affect American military planning.

Yet in fact, Johnson began playing “grandmother's footsteps” some time before last week's request to Congress. Here it is necessary to examine the original Johnsonian economy program. It had two phases. In the first phase, Johnson was to save \$1,000,000,000 out of appropriations for the fiscal year ending next June 30. This sum was to be actually returned to the Treasury, presumably with suitably grandiloquent Johnsonian gestures.

The second phase was to have seen the 1951 defense budget held to a \$13,000,000,000 maximum, with twelve billion envisaged as the limit thereafter. Well into this year, months after the Soviet atomic explosion, Johnson was still loudly talking this kind of economy. Then (is it possible to suspect that reports appearing in this space had a little to do with it?) the game of “grandmother's footsteps” began. Various increases in American armed strength (which were not really increases at all, but reductions in strength somewhat less drastic than originally planned) were announced with a flourish.

Economies, it was announced, had made these increases possible. Some perfectly authentic economies have undoubtedly been made. Chairman CARL VINSON, in a recent brilliant, too little noticed speech, credited Johnson with \$600,000,000 in real savings, against \$1,500,000,000 “cut into the sinew and muscle of the armed services.” But what really happened was that Johnson quietly abandoned the idea of handing the unfortunate taxpayer a poisoned plum, and spent the money instead, on what the Pentagon calls hardware—arms.

This was the first quick, silent dash in Johnson's game of “grandmother's footsteps.” Last week's request was the second. Future dashes are clearly in prospect. The events which have so suddenly and belatedly forced themselves on Johnson's attention, says

Johnson, “make it entirely possible that appropriations in excess of those which have been requested for the current fiscal year will be required in succeeding years, not only for our own military forces but also for the military-aid program.”

In short, with the 1951 defense ceiling already breached, the Johnsonian economy program is to be relegated to the ash can as inconspicuously as possible, while Johnson continues to shout economy, at the top of his lungs. Unfortunately, this almost certainly does not mean that the great effort required by the world situation will be made.

In his remarkable speech, Chairman VINSON documented all that has been said in this space, and more, of the extraordinary damage inflicted by Johnson on the military posture of the United States. This damage cannot possibly be repaired without a total reversal, as public as a strip tease, of Johnson's position. And if Johnson made so public a confession of previous error, the “it”—the American public—would then catch him out in his little game.

“I will leave it to others,” said Chairman VINSON, “to sell this idea that we rise by falling, that we advance by retreating, that we can achieve strength through weakness.” One question remains to be asked. Is the man who has consistently attempted to sell this idea—an idea which bears within it the seed of our destruction—fit to hold the position he now holds?

Let me say, please, as a valedictory, that we may dream of the day when wars shall cease; it does no harm; on the contrary, every effort to bring about the realization of such dreams is commendable and deserves our support so long as it does not strip us of our defenses, develop a condition of unpreparedness, or lay us open to or invite attack. We must shake ourselves out of the trance and face facts, for, while we are dreaming, the grim reality stares us in the face that if we are to have universal peace, we will have to be prepared to do our part to obtain it, and, if necessary, to fight for and to maintain it.

Yes, we dream of the day when swords shall be sheathed forever, and our weapons turned into plowshares and pruning hooks; and those days of which Longfellow sang, when he said:

Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the
skies!

But beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise.

But the road to universal peace is a tortuous path which leads down the dark future through long generations, involving the Christianization of the world—an end devoutly to be sought, eventually to be obtained—but obviously ages hence.

The sober realization of a people who do not allow their idealism to divorce them from stark reality and their clear conception of the foibles and idiosyncracies of human nature impresses the fact upon them that just so long as racial hatred and discrimination, economic rivalry between nations for world markets, and arrogant nationalism remain, and communism persists in its atrocious attempts, disarmament and a pacific world cannot be.

The fate of civilization has always hung in the balance, but there are certain ideals of civilization which cannot

be destroyed. The progress of humanity throughout the centuries is marked by the bloody battlefields which have made possible our achievements. The arts of peace will not always prevail. Nations, no more than individuals, will always keep their word. Why will we not realize that civilization in itself comprehends the struggle for advancement, and that the opposition it meets must be overcome? When principle or honor is at stake, no man or nation is entitled to live who is not willing to fight to maintain it.

I should like to believe that human nature had changed, but the hard cold facts are that no plan has been promulgated in our day or generation that will change human nature or bring about the millenium by contract. No covenant which has ever been made or will be entered into in this day of grace between and among nations will prove a perfect panacea for or perfect preventive of war. The truth is that neither you nor I, our children or great-grandchildren, will live long enough to see the day when it will be unnecessary to maintain a sufficient force to guarantee safety and to keep the peace.

The fight between good and evil has just begun. Old as the beginning of things, yet young as tomorrow when it is born, the struggle between these two opposing forces must go on forever through all history to the end. Those who believe in the eventual triumph of the right must still march and fight and fall, recruited from the flower of mankind, cheered only by their own hope of and for humanity, strong only in their confidence in their cause.

It pays to be prepared.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to break into the thoughts so ably presented by my colleague from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]. His speech was such an excellent one that I wish it could have continued much longer.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I want to state to the gentleman from Florida and to the Committee that it has been my privilege to listen to a great many speeches during the years I have served in this House, but the speech just made by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont I consider one of the best I have heard in years and years.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege for me to serve on the Committee on Armed Services of the great Committee on Appropriations, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, whose work is so widely recognized. It has been a great privilege to serve with the other members of the subcommittee, men of sterling quality and great ability. One of them in particular I want to single out, because he is leaving the committee and leaving the Congress. Mr. Chairman, we shall miss the gentleman from Michigan, ALBERT ENGEL. It has been a

signal honor for me to work with him and to see the uniformly high standard of his work, his complete unselfishness, his devotion to duty, and the fine character of the public service that he has rendered here through the many years.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation to the clerical staff of our subcommittee. I do not think any committee in Congress is more fortunate than we in the men who have worked with us.

My colleague from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has ably presented a general outline of the budget on armed services, as presented to our subcommittee. He has told you of the over-all amount, the funds allocated for each of the services; the fact that the committee, seeking to find economy, has cut \$203,000,000 from the over-all total, and, upon the urgent request of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, agreed to by the President, that we have agreed to the restoration of a small part of this money. We have further agreed to an appropriation of additional funds for aircraft procurement and for antisubmarine activities.

Our recommendations are based largely on budgetary estimates. World conditions have not permitted major changes in budget recommendations. Changes that have been made are small ones where the committee felt savings could be made. This year's budget is substantially the same as last year's. Pay increases brought about by action of the Congress in the last session are responsible for an increased cost of \$500,000,000. This includes military and civilian personnel. Thus, for the same money we are buying a half billion dollars less in defense.

Actually, we are weaker than we think. I say this despite the fact that the Chiefs of Services testified without exception, that qualitatively our defenses are stronger than at any time since the war actually ended. Qualitatively we are stronger. Quantitatively there is a big gap in what we have and what we need for mobilization in case of a global war.

The committee's problem has been first to decide how much defense the country can afford, and next how to allocate the defense dollars between the services. If we knew what to anticipate trouble, the problem would be very simple. Since we do not know, we have no choice but to try to maintain a first-class defense qualitatively, and deliberately to sacrifice quantity.

We must place emphasis on development, for it is in superiority of weapons and equipment that our greatest strength lies. For a time we could rely principally upon atomic monopoly plus strategic air power. That monopoly no longer exists and we must give closer attention to the development of technical air power, ground defenses, guided missiles, jam-proof communications, and antisubmarine measures.

The cost of defense in the United States is terribly high compared, for instance, to that in the Soviet Union. Their pay scale is about one-tenth as high as ours. Food and care provided

for their military personnel are correspondingly lower. In the occupied areas and their allied countries, the Russian troops live on the country. This makes a vast difference in the amount of defenses for a given sum.

We have emphasized hardware—not men—on the ground that, in the main, men can be speedily called in and given the necessary training in event of trouble. Modern machines of war are highly complicated, exceedingly technical, and in some instances they take years to develop or build. Always the hardware for modern defenses is costly. For instance, the electronics equipment in an average modern plane costs more than the entire plane would have cost during World War II. An infantry division now has 20,000 weapons, 2,000 radios, 4,000 vehicles. There is in this budget a \$600,000,000 item for Army ordnance and yet this is a small part of Army ordnance needs. Primarily it is to buy antiaircraft guns or aiming devices. Our antiaircraft equipment must be as good as the planes we may have to fight, and planes fly so fast and so high that human calculations are no longer adequate to aim and fire the guns we use against them. Tank procurement, largely neglected since the war, is again forcibly thrust into our consideration for the Russians are known to possess many thousands of heavy tanks. Those who encountered the German tiger tanks have a most wholesome respect for them. The Russian tanks are patterned on these heavy German tanks. This too is a costly field.

Adding to the committee's problems is the fact that now that we have no monopoly on atomic warfare, we must accept a realization that there is no sure defense against atomic bombs. The Russians possess many B-29-type planes. These planes are adequate for a one-way trip from territory now held by the Soviets to any point in the United States. A one-way trip to deliver atomic bombs would hold no fears for Russian fliers who would expect to find friends in the underground here, or at the least, to be comfortably housed and fed as prisoners of war for the duration of hostilities.

The committee members cannot call themselves experts in war. They must take the advice and counsel of men who are experts in war. These men have placed emphasis primarily on planes. However, such an authority as Vannoy Bush has indicated that guided missiles may soon render the big bomber obsolete. I have felt and have repeatedly stated that guided-missiles development has not sufficiently been emphasized. Historically, many Americans in positions of high military authority fight their wars in the past. They continue to emphasize the weapons with which their medals and their glory were won. For that reason, in particular, we have almost invariably started our wars with the weapons of the last war. There is less of that spirit now. There is emphasis on the development of new weapons, including guided missiles. Yet I do not think there is enough emphasis. In addition, there have been delays in the guided-missiles program which testi-

many showed were not due to lack of funds. It is entirely possible that within the next 5 to 10 years, the huge and highly technical planes, costing up to \$5,000,000 each, may be rendered utterly useless by radar-guided rockets.

That condition is not true now. At the moment, we do have to depend largely upon planes for our primary war objective in the early days of war; that of powerful attack and secure defense. The need for additional aircraft procurement, in order that our air force and naval aviation may stay modern is not news to the committee. During the long weeks of hearings, we asked questions time and again, whose answers showed that aircraft procurement would have to be stepped up if the air services are to be kept modern.

Nor is the increasing gravity of world conditions news to Congress. The atomic bomb in Russia was exploded months ago. The loss of China and the gravity of Asiatic conditions was conceded months ago. The step-up in cold war by Russia was obvious months ago. Our committee asked many questions about the effect of these activities upon the request of funds by defense chiefs. Only when emphasis was added by General Eisenhower and Chairman Vinson did the defense chiefs publicly take cognizance of changed world conditions. I confess I am puzzled by the reasoning which has produced the conclusions submitted to us at this late date.

Be that as it may, the committee endorses the recommendations of the people upon whose advice we must depend. We recommend \$350,000,000 additional to the funds formerly agreed on. That amount sounds big—actually, it does not buy much because it is chiefly directed at high-priced planes.

Two hundred millions additional will be provided for the Air Force. This will buy 77 new planes. It will modernize 228 primary trainers. It will convert 71 medium bombers of the B-29 type to tankers principally for refueling in air.

For the additional \$100,000,000 for naval aviation, we will be able to procure 95 new planes.

Fifty millions of dollars is also provided for antisubmarine work, probably our greatest immediate need. Snorkel equipment and high submerged speeds of present-day submarines make our antisubmarine equipment largely obsolete. Hitler nearly choked off our life lines with a much smaller submarine fleet and a much less potent submarine fleet than the Russians now have.

We will also get four Marine air squadrons—not groups—which would have been deactivated, but no additional funds are requested for this. It is made possible by transfers.

I said a moment ago that the committee had long realized that additional plane procurement would be necessary if our Air Force and naval aviation are to stay modern. Testimony revealed that within a very few years both services will have to depend increasingly upon second-line planes because there will not be sufficient new, modern planes coming off the assembly lines to replace planes that

are dropping out and to keep abreast of world conditions. One billion three hundred and fifty millions originally recommended for Air Force plane procurement in 1951 would have purchased 1,383 planes. In order to maintain a 48-group modern Air Force plus 11 modern National Guard groups, 2,000 new planes yearly are required at a cost of \$2,000,000,000. Thus, originally we were short 617 needed new planes. Under the adjusted program we will get 77 additional planes. That means we are still short 540 planes.

The naval aviation picture is substantially similar. The original request for Navy planes was six hundred and thirty-three millions for 1951 with which to purchase 817 planes. To maintain present levels and to keep naval aviation modern, we will need 1,347 new planes yearly. To the 817 originally planned, 95 are now added for a total of 922 planes. The Navy is still short 435 planes, or one-third of its needs. But there is more to the Navy picture than appears on the surface. Navy plans are now based on approximately 60 percent of the 1949 strength. Nineteen hundred and forty-nine is the postwar year which probably is the most nearly comparable in gravity to this one. Yet naval strength is held to 60 percent of the estimated needs for that year and we are providing only two-thirds of the planes which would be required to maintain that 60-percent level. This is a most disturbing situation.

Naval and Marine Air Reserves train with modern jet planes, but there are no jet planes available for them to man if they should be mobilized for service. For this purpose 819 planes would be needed at a cost of \$650,000,000. The Navy needs an additional four hundred and fifty million annually to keep its naval aviation fully modern. Perhaps I should add at this place that the weakness is not in the Navy. The Navy in particular deserves a pat on the back for the efficiency of its operation and the way in which it has kept down administrative costs.

I have repeatedly mentioned the high cost of defense today. One chapter which will illustrate this is the additional cost of overhauling and operating jet engines, to which we are turning more and more. The cost of overhauling a jet engine runs from \$6,000 up. It is twice as costly as the overhauling of a conventional-type engine. Yet jet planes have to be overhauled four times as frequently as conventional engines. Then, in addition, the cost of operation of the jet in flight is two to four times as great. The old P-51, which was a very good plane, used 64 gallons of fuel per hour at a cost of \$13.41. The P-80, which is probably the most nearly standard of the jets, requires 348 gallons of fuel per hour at a cost of \$50.48—all this just to go twice as fast. This should give ominous warning of the cost of defense—and of war—in future years.

Yet as much as we depend upon the air services and as much as we recognize the necessity of first-line equipment and training, we know this is an air age only in part. It costs too much and requires

too many planes to move troops and cargo by air alone. In World War II, only 5 years ended, we moved by ship 720,000 tons of cargo daily. We moved several million soldiers across the ocean each way. During this time we brought in countless thousands of tons of strategic and essential war materials without which we could not have built weapons. And we supplied our allies with those weapons and with food. We still cannot put all our eggs in one basket. We have presented a bill which provides a balanced force at the lowest possible safe cost.

I want to point to several interesting chapters, some of them small in application, some of them important in the long pull. The services are doing a magnificent job in research and development and they are enjoying an unusually fine degree of cooperation from industrial and educational institutions. This work, I believe, has reached the highest plane ever achieved in this country.

One interesting point is the development of titanium. If for no other reason it would be interesting because of the depletion of iron ores. But that is not all. Titanium alloys are 40 percent lighter than steel. It is stronger than steel. It is the fourth most abundant structural metal in the earth's crust. Its resistance to corrosion is as great as platinum—better than nickel. Heretofore it has been too costly for general use. New methods are now taking care of that limitation. It may be the metal of tomorrow.

Not all of the work of the services is of this high caliber. There is, for instance, the build and repair program. All the services testified that World War II surplus materials are rotting and rusting rapidly. Much of this material will very soon be beyond recovery. Roughly, it costs only one-fourth as much to repair and rebuild a piece of machinery or a weapon as it cost to buy it new. Much of the surplus material is standard equipment of a type still in use and is as valuable as new equipment to the services when rebuilt or repaired. Yet only the Navy seems to have done a top-flight job in this field. For \$30,000,000 the Navy is in the process of reclassifying or rehabilitating 2,000,000 tons of this material worth approximately \$2,000,000,000. Already they have reincorporated into the service \$155,000,000 worth of weapons and equipment as good as new. They will have completed the job by the end of fiscal 1951. Among the reasons given by the other services for not completing this work is the Johnson economy order which laid off many civilians who were engaged in this important work.

The committee found that bonuses are still being paid for service in combat areas for ship crews. This is because of mine dangers. The last known incident occurred about 2 years ago. Nobody got hurt. Yet we are continuing to pay \$2,500,000 annually for service in danger areas which apparently have largely ceased to be danger areas.

The committee found that moving from office to office is very popular in the

Pentagon. Apparently it takes up a lot of time. More important, it costs about \$1,000,000 a year. There seems to be no rhyme or reason for the continuous shifting of people within the building.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the gentleman's committee gone into the matter of two branches of the service under unification really carrying out unification so as to save money, or is the duplication still going on?

Mr. SIKES. The committee has gone very thoroughly into that field. Sometimes we have felt that instead of unification we were securing triplication.

As a matter of fact, however, I think there is an effort on the part of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to achieve unification. I think the services are achieving unification. It is taking time. They are not achieving it as fast as they should and could and therefore they are not saving as much as we hoped for.

Mr. CURTIS. I am certainly not an expert in these things. I believe I have evidence of a case where one branch of the service at a cost of millions of dollars is enlarging and rebuilding and expanding a facility to do something which another branch of the service has an idle plant to do within 35 miles.

Mr. SIKES. In a number of cases the committee explored reports of that kind. The committee never was able to substantiate charges that that sort of thing was being done. In each case which was called to our attention it was found the new work was something necessitated by modern warfare which was not being done or could not be done at existing plants.

I do not say that duplication has not been the case. If the gentleman has evidence, I am sure the committee would like to have that evidence in order that we may further pursue the matter. But the committee has not found instances where upon investigation it was found that those practices of duplication were being indulged in.

Mr. CURTIS. The matter whereof I speak, I have laid before Secretary Johnson.

Mr. SIKES. I believe the gentleman has done the proper thing.

Mr. CURTIS. We are at this disadvantage, however. If the ordinary layman makes such a contention and those high in military circles say that is not so, that is the end of the case.

Mr. SIKES. I know exactly what the gentleman is talking about. The services can wrap up answers in high-sounding technical language which is incomprehensible to the layman. Unless you can get the responsible people across the committee table where you can ferret out the cold facts, you may not really learn what is being done. But the committee has tried to ferret out the cold facts. If the gentleman is not satisfied with the information he gets, I am sure the committee will be glad to explore the matter further.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In some instances is it not true there is a merger rather than unification of some of the services?

Mr. SIKES. That appears to be the case in some instances. But in the main I think there is an effort to achieve unification and to save money by doing so. It is taking a long time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been listening with intense interest to the statement of the gentleman from Florida. I think he is making a brilliant speech. The gentleman served with me on the old Committee on Military Affairs and now the Committee on Armed Services. We feel his loss on that committee. In these dark days through which we are passing, I believe every Member of the House ought to read the address which the gentleman is now making, with great care and thought because I know what effect the experience and knowledge set forth in the gentleman's address will have upon the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman is very kind. I have had no finer experience than that of serving with the distinguished and able gentleman from Louisiana on the old Committee on Military Affairs, later the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Chairman, to get back to some of the little weaknesses in the services that came out during the testimony. We found that the services expect to buy new desks and office equipment each 10 years and they base their requisitions accordingly. I do not know what kind of desks they buy in government offices, but I know that my desk which was not new when I inherited it, has been used 10 years by me. It looks about as good as it did when I got it. The services testify that they base their requirements for new office equipment each 10 years on the experience of business firms. I am sure that they are not the kind of businesses that I have been associated with in Florida.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I suggest that perhaps one of the reasons the gentleman's desk is so well preserved is that it is not moved around as often as some of the desks are moved in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. SIKES. That is entirely possible.

Mr. Chairman, we found the Air Force proposes to build an academy similar to that at West Point and the academy at Annapolis at a cost of 160 to 200 millions of dollars.

It has sent out teams and examined some 250 sites, all of this without authorization from Congress. Even if the matter does not proceed beyond the point of examining 250 sites, a lot of expense will have been incurred, possibly for nothing.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has many times pointed to the folly of spending \$2,800 on battle equipped jeeps for station use here at

home. Yet, only this year would the services reluctantly agree to start using standard jeeps for routine station use.

Last summer we passed a housing measure known as the Wherry Act. It was passed primarily at the request of defense chiefs who insisted, and we know it to be true, that housing needs at military installations are possibly the most aggravated local problem we have. Until this date, practically no use has been made of the Wherry Act. This is inexcusable for the need for housing still exists and the Wherry Act would utilize private initiative. The initiative is there. Builders are clamoring for a chance to provide housing under the Wherry Act. The services are bogged down in red tape and regulations of their own making.

I have one quarrel with the training programs of the service academies. Students at West Point and Annapolis get general training for 4 years. Then, after graduating, they have to start specializing in whatever department of the service, Army, Navy, or Air Force, they are going to devote their life work to. This usually means additional college training. The old practice was all right in the days when a man could be familiar with all the weapons in all the departments of the Defense Establishment. It is behind the times now. When students go to college they, in most instances, get 2 years of general training; then they begin to specialize. If the services adopted the policies which have been found most practical for most students outside the military academies, they could save valuable time plus the cost of additional training later for their graduates.

The greatest quarrel the committee has had with the services has been the use of funds for other than the purposes for which they were appropriated. The legality or the constitutionality of this practice is questioned. It appears to be an effort to circumvent the clear responsibility of the Congress to appropriate funds for the services, and to determine the use to which those funds shall be put.

Compared to the over-all scope of our military preparedness picture, these are relatively minor items. I do not want to leave the impression that I have a lack of confidence in the military chiefs or the military establishments. I do have great confidence in them. I feel that we have some of the ablest leadership the services have ever enjoyed and I subscribe to the statement that qualitatively our defenses are at their highest peacetime peak. There are relatively few changes that I think could advantageously be made at this time in the present picture, or in this bill as written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, personally I think that it is unfortunate there has not been a larger attendance on the floor this afternoon

to hear the speeches that have been made on the subject of national defense. They have been outstanding, and I commend them to the reading of the entire membership.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in listening to the discussion which has been had, it has been brought forcibly to my attention that the House is probably about to lose the services of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. It was my privilege to sit at his elbow for 9 years on this particular subcommittee, or the subcommittee which dealt with the appropriations for the Army and the Air Force, and for the civil functions of the Army, from the first of 1940 through 1948. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] really needs no praise from me. His record has been written across the country, a record of vigilant economy, a record of vigilance for the soundness of the national defense of the United States.

I hope that the people of Michigan appreciate the opportunity they have of continuing in public life a gentleman with the capacity, the integrity, and the ability of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order that I may bring to the attention of the membership a letter which I received from Lt. Gen. E. W. Rawlings, Deputy Chief of Staff, of the United States Air Force, and comptroller of the Air Force funds. The letter was received in response to a letter which I wrote to him under date of April 6, 1950, in which I requested specific information in regard to the proportion of Air Force, fiscal 1950 funds, that were frozen by the President. The date of the reply is April 19, 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read the letter at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1950.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: This is in reply to your letter of April 6, 1950, in which you requested information regarding Department of the Air Force fiscal year 1950 funds which were frozen by the President.

Following the enactment of the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill, the President directed the Secretary of Defense to reserve the additional funds added by the Congress to the President's 48-group budget for the purpose of building up toward a 58-group Air Force. As a result, the following funds were placed in reserve.

Appropriation:

Construction of aircraft and related procurement.....	Amount \$577,755,000
Special procurement.....	8,338,000
Maintenance and operation...	130,928,000
Research and development...	18,000,000
Contingencies	733,000

Total..... 735,754,000

Next is a point to which I wish to call particular attention:

Had the Air Force been authorized to obligate the entire appropriations enacted by

the Congress for fiscal year 1950, the aircraft procurement program for that fiscal year—

That is, for the current year—

would have been expanded from 1,250 to 1,832 aircraft and the Air Force would have continued its build-up toward a 58-group level.

I want to interpolate again to say that I want the record to be clear as to why we have not built up to the 58-group air force. Congress last year appropriated the funds. They were frozen, and the effect of that freezing was to hold us below the 58-group level; and instead of a procurement of 1,832 aircraft, the freeze held us down to 1,250.

Now, proceeding with the letter:

In the case of research and development, the reservation of funds in this appropriation resulted in the slowing down of the rate of development, and, in some instances, the elimination of certain projects.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has called attention to the tendency of this country and perhaps other countries to try to fight a future war with weapons of the past. That is historically true, but it is also historically true that we usually in the course of a war do not get any weapons which were not on the drawing boards prior to the start of that war. To get new weapons they have to be worked out and they have to be on the drawing boards and in a state of development.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is also a very pertinent part of the consideration to take into consideration the interim time that is involved from the time they are in the drawing board stage until they are literally in production.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That certainly is true.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Particularly in making up the interim time there is a lag in production. The lapse of time from the drawing board stage to front line use is about 2½ years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I remember, and I believe Members who were serving on this committee 3 or 4 years ago also will remember the time, when General LeMay appeared before our committee when we were discussing certain research and development funds which had been transferred to pay purposes. General LeMay told us that at least 18 months had been lost in progress through that transfer of funds. That is why this freezing of the funds we appropriated last year could be serious. For this reason the public and the country should know that it was not done by action of the Congress but was done by the President after Congress had provided the funds.

Continuing now with General Rawlings' letter—and bear in mind this letter was not a voluntary offering on his part, but is entirely in response to my inquiry to him—General Rawlings states:

The placing of these funds in reserve had no effect on the radar screen, and this program is being prosecuted as originally planned. However, it should be pointed out that the fiscal year 1950 appropriations bill did not provide funds specifically for this activity. Provision was made in the bill,

however, for the transfer to the "Acquisition and construction of real property" appropriation of the funds required to finance this program. Such action necessitated the reprogramming of activities in the "Aircraft and related procurement" and "Maintenance and operations" appropriations to the extent necessary to finance the fiscal year 1950 increment of the radar screen.

The total amount which the conferees of the House and the Senate added to the appropriation estimates of the Department of the Air Force for fiscal year 1950, as passed by the Congress, was \$735,754,000. The amount set aside in reserve by direction of the President also totaled \$735,754,000.

Sincerely yours,
E. W. RAWLINGS,
Lieutenant General,
United States Air Force,
Deputy Chief of Staff, Comptroller.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to remember the fact that the amount frozen by the President, \$735,754,000, is exactly the amount which the Congress on its own motion and initiative last year appropriated and said: "Here are the funds for the Air Force. We, the Congress, have provided them. We want you to build up a 58-group air force. We want you to proceed with research and development, we want you to proceed with the aircraft procurement program."

That amount, \$735,000,000, which the Congress on its own motion provided, was the exact amount later frozen and set aside by direction of the President.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as remains on this side to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

VALUE OF CIVIL WORKS TO THE CORPS OF
ENGINEERS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, today's way of global war, with its ever-increasing emphasis on logistics—has given rise to the expression that war today is an engineer's war. That statement—while appropriate—is, of course, a generalization. War belongs primarily to the man who wields the individual weapon. In the ground force, that man is the infantryman. In the Air Force, it is the man who drops the bomb or mans the machine gun. All efforts made by all other branches and services of the military establishment are only to assist him.

Yet, with the vast distances, variety of climates, and multiplicity of technical problems involved in war today, one would be amiss if he should underestimate the ever-increasing importance of logistics—of engineering. For the success of the man who wields the gun depends increasingly on production, transport and supply. On having his combat power ever-increased by both construction and destruction. On having his movements facilitated, while those of the enemy are impeded.

It was the ability of the American military engineers in World War II to build a road, construct an airfield, rehabilitate a port, lay a pipeline, tear away a jungle, and throw a bridge across a river faster and more efficiently than ever had been done before that collapsed every strategic timetable of the Axis high command.

In the final analysis, it is the engineer who, today, in large measure, must marshal a Nation's work-power at its greatest and speediest efficiency, and place this

combination of natural and industrial resources at the disposal of the military command.

In World War II, this marshalling of American work power—the providing of design, material, and equipment—the construction of war plants, posts, camps, stations, airfields, utilities, pipe lines, storage facilities, roads, docks, and bridges—both at home and wherever over the world the Army needed them—constituted the greatest challenge ever hurled at the military engineer.

But the challenge was met. Proof of that fact is recorded in two great days—VE-day and VJ-day.

The following excerpts are taken from the wartime dispatches of famous American newspapermen and war correspondents. The dispatches were written on scene and carry the person right to the front.

By Walter McCallum, war correspondent from the Washington Star:

Fanatical German Lieutenant General Ramcke, commandant of the Brest fortress, which held out for weeks in an isolated pocket before surrender, stood up in an airplane flying high over the harbor of Cherbourg and said in guttural German, "My God, how can this be?" Below him were the funnels and stacks of a literal forest of ships, Allied ships of all kinds and sizes bringing the material of war to France. "They told us Cherbourg could not be used as a port," he muttered. "The general staff told us that."

The port engineers did one of those typical American will-to-win jobs at Cherbourg. Soon after its capture on June 27 they were hard at work clearing away the sunken ships, the toppled freight cars and the other obstacles which blocked use of the port. The engineers never stop. They work on at night under bright lights along the quay sides. They work in relays of 12 hours on and off. One of the real problems is rest. They never get any.

By William L. Shirer, war correspondent:

In the strange world of the airplane swooping down on bases humming with activity in weird places, which never heard the hum of a motor 3 years ago, one sees whatever constructive side there is to the war. At these bases American engineers, American labor, and American ingenuity have wrought miracles, and when the firing ceases these places will have value as a foundation for world-wide air transport which will make the world seem small indeed. The eyes of the French officer with me pop in amazement as he sees these things for the first time. "Ah," he exclaims, "you Americans know the secret of combining imagination and hard work, and the result is miraculous. In Europe our imagination was dulled and the people had forgotten the rewards of labor and therefore worked as little as possible. No people of Europe could construct these things. The future belongs to you, if you realize it."

By Kenneth L. Dixon, war correspondent for the Associated Press:

The engineers have frosty ears and they don't fool around with trifles. That is about all that is printable of the new version of that ancient ballad of the Army's battling bridge builders whose trifles in this First Army offensive consist chiefly of snow, ice, fog, and zero weather. Of course they have had a few incidental trifles in the form of enemy mines, shells, and bullets, but those are the standard occupational hazards for

combat engineers. Only by working day and night through blizzards and cruel, cutting cold have the engineers been able to keep the roads comparatively clear in this offensive. They have improvised freak snow-plows, ice-breakers, and nonskid materials. They have gone without sleep, without food often and kept every available piece of equipment in operation. The Germans originally held this territory. When the Yanks first drove through here the enemy blew all the bridges and mined the terrain. So American engineers rebuilt the bridges and cleared the minefields. Then came the German counterattack and the Yanks blew the bridges behind them and spread mines. Now the Americans are on the offensive again and the retreating Germans again are blowing the bridges and sowing mines in the same fields.

This achievement by the American Army engineers has since been referred to as "the American miracle." But, actually, it was no miracle at all. It was the results—the rich dividends—of accumulated experience, knowledge, and skills acquired by the Corps of Engineers during almost two centuries of continuous active service. It was the pay-off of this Nation's traditional—and unique—peacetime policy of giving the Army engineers jobs that are both civil and military. The nucleus of the engineers' wartime forces has always been an established organization of officers and civilians kept ever-ready with the practical skills of modern engineering.

Without diminishing even slightly the gigantic stature of such a task, it can be said that the construction phase of the war was a natural for the engineers. For 176 years, the Army Corps of Engineers had been a principle instrument in the hands of a democratic people building a nation. As an organization, it was accustomed to taking on the major construction projects of each era in the country's history.

For years, the Army engineers had supervised construction of large flood-control projects, and river and harbor improvements. They had worked closely with the Nation's construction industry from its early beginning to its growth into one of the wonders of the world. They had the basic organization, the experienced personnel, the technical information, the methods. Consequently, with equipment of this kind, in the hands of experienced men who had inherited the knowledge and methods used on thousands of peacetime construction jobs, they had a decided edge on the enemy.

The value of this type of engineering organization is incalculable.

The value of the Corps of Engineers' civil-works program in times of peace is extensively understood and appreciated by the American people. Only a relatively few people, however, know of the program's military value. Yet, this military value can hardly be overestimated. For the civil-works program, as assigned to the Corps of Engineers by the Congress, provides the proper training ground and Nation-wide engineering organization that, in time of war, establishes the United States Army engineers as the most efficient among modern nations.

At the outset of World War II, the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers was of a size previously unknown. The enormous construction task, and the additional responsibility of engineer procurement, were successfully accomplished through the agency of the corps' civil-works organization. Without that organization, already functioning in the field, the problem would have been impossible of solution within acceptable time limits.

It is virtually certain that in any future war the demand will be even heavier, and that it will develop with incredible rapidity. If an organization for this work does not exist at the outset of the emergency, it will be an almost hopeless task to organize one after the emergency arises.

The cost of maintaining such an essential engineering organization as the Corps of Engineers maintains, solely as a military stand-by to meet an emergency, would be prohibitive. But, as an organization responsible for the civil-works functions it has long performed, it is always ready—decentralized and flexible, capable of immediate expansion and contraction to meet varying work loads—in peace or in war.

The following extract is from a letter written last year to the Chief of Engineers by the British engineer in chief, after his official visit to this country:

During my visit to the United States last June, I was privileged to see many of the very large works now being carried out under the responsible charge of officers of the Corps of Engineers. While viewing these great undertakings I was very greatly impressed by all I saw and I certainly learned many lessons. One point which struck me most forcibly wherever I went was the very great opportunity which this work affords for providing technical education and practical engineer training for your officers—both junior and senior. We, in England, fully realize the importance of practical experience in the carrying out of engineering projects in peace, in order to fit our engineer officers for the heavy responsibilities which fall upon many of them in war, but for many reasons we fail to provide this experience on anything but a very modest scale. It was, therefore, with feelings of considerable envy that I saw what you actually achieve.

I have always been firmly of the opinion that this type of training is not only desirable but essential, and my experiences in two large theaters during World War II most fully confirmed that view. There was no type of civil-works project that did not have its counterpart in war, and often on a huge scale. Furthermore, I am convinced that in every successive war we military engineers will be called upon to carry out larger and more difficult tasks. As the power and mobility of armies is increased by science and mechanization, so do their demands upon their engineers grow in proportion.

To the great value of the civil works field organization, and its potential wartime operating capacity, must be added the opportunity which civil functions provide for the engineer officer to obtain wide professional experience.

Approximately 200 engineer officers are assigned to the civil-works program at all times. And though much has been said of this relatively small number in recent months, hardly any reference has been made to the fact that the off-

cers are rotated. The policy is not a static affair, but one in which change is continuous. So much so that during his full career, an engineer officer has ample opportunity to receive the well-rounded, practical experience that throughout its history has made the American Army engineer a successful leader in military operations.

For example, Gen. Lucius Clay was completing the world's largest earth dam on the Red River in Texas when the late war began. Gen. Brehon Somervell, wartime Chief of Supply for the Army, was reassigned numerous times during his career to the civil-works program. Maj. Gen. Hugh J. Casey, who was chief engineer of General MacArthur's command from Bataan to the occupation of Japan, returned this past August after 8 years in the Pacific, and was reassigned as division engineer of the Ohio River division, until his retirement from active duty. Brig. Gen. John F. Conklin had years of practical experience on various civil-works projects prior to establishing his military reputation as chief engineer of General Patton's fast-moving, hard-hitting Third Army. Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler received invaluable practical experience on numerous civil-works assignments prior to establishing history's greatest supply line, and subsequently becoming wartime Deputy Chief of Allied Forces in the India-Burma theater, and the first postwar Chief of Engineers.

To be successful in a position of great technical responsibility in war, an engineer officer must possess a wide knowledge of engineering and construction methods, he must be versatile, and he must be self-confident. These attributes can be attained only by diversified experience.

The purely military engineering, which is done in time of peace, is neither sufficiently large in volume nor complex in character to afford him that necessary experience. But in the civil-works organization he has this opportunity. In addition, the civilians of the organization provide a valuable reservoir from which to draw emergency officers for military construction and other technical duties in theaters of operations.

In brief, the value of the civil-works organization to the national defense lies both in its capacity as a Nation-wide, territorially operating agency in war, and in the professional opportunities it affords individual engineer officers. Should this organization be lost to the Corps of Engineers, the damage would be irreparable.

In time of war, a nation's strength—and potential success—is measured by its outstanding possession of three great powers, or forces—combat, production, and construction. This Nation has proved itself without a peer in each of these fields. Under the United States Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers is unique among the services and branches in that its mission includes assignment in each major field. And its wartime construction power—which dovetails directly with production and combat power—is definitely tied in with its peacetime civil-works program.

The development of atomic energy was not an engineer job. It was a result of scientific endeavor. However, the atom bomb was definitely an engineer project. The bomb was a product of the Manhattan District, which was headed and staffed by officers of the Corps of Engineers.

Such are a few commentaries which I have obtained, from time to time, and have preserved with reference to the magnificent work of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. This record speaks in such glowing terms of outstanding and patriotic contribution to the growth of this Nation that I had reached the point of believing that no one would seriously attack the integrity of, or the work of the Army engineers. Much to my surprise, within the last year and a half a real campaign has been developing to take from the Corps of Engineers the civil function of the flood control, rivers and harbors, work which it has been carrying on for 148 years. Opponents of the engineers have found to accomplish this result they have had to tear down the Corps of Engineers in the minds of the American people, and at the same time to extol the virtues of the Interior Department. This campaign has been going on throughout the country, in the official life in Washington, and even in Congress itself. The Hoover Commission report to which frequent reference has been made, the bill before the Armed Services Committee of the House to which I have made reference, the report of the Appropriations Committee of the House, together with other recent developments, are indicative of the terrific onslaught that is now being made against one of the departments of our national defense.

I do not believe this campaign will be successful. I do not share sympathy with any of those who assail the patriotic part which the engineers have played in the development of our country. I think we will win, but we will not win without a terrific effort on our part. We will modify and change the bill before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives; we will oppose the Hoover Report to the extent necessary to save the civil function work of the Corps of Engineers and we will, on the floor of the House, refute the vicious attacks which the Appropriations Committee report makes upon this organization.

The training which the Corps of Engineers receives in time of peace from this work on the rivers and harbors and in the flood control throughout the country is worth hundreds of millions of dollars to this Nation. It gives this country the finest Engineer Corps in any country in the world. It maintains the efficiency of the national defense, and by doing so helps to maintain the independence of our country against the encroachment of the Soviet and its satellites who would crush and engulf democratic government throughout the world.

In conclusion I wish to say that during the course of the war I had occasion to land on the Normandy beachhead some time after the tide of the invasion swept inland from the North Sea. When I landed with a group from the Military

Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives the first object which I saw was a stone shaft raising itself above the sands of the Utah Beach of Normandy. I was startled to find such a monument existing at a point which a few weeks previously had felt the full tide of the allied invasion of Europe with the host led by General Eisenhower. I approached this stone shaft some 15 or 20 feet high and read the proud inscription which combat troops had placed upon it long before the echoing sound of the cannon had fully died away. The tablet placed there reads as follows:

In proud memory of our dead—First Engineers Special Brigade—H-hour, 0630; D-day, 6 June 1944.

In other words, this tablet indicates an engineer battalion had actually landed on the Utah Beach 6 hours before date set for the invasion and had prepared the way for those tens of thousands who followed quickly.

I say my friends, I challenge those statements which attack the efficiency of the engineers. They come with poor grace at this time, leveled as they are against an organization which performed such efficient and proud a part in the records of the history of our country. We certainly should not tolerate any change which reduces the authority of the engineers or is harmful to this organization.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues who have so eloquently spoken on this part of the appropriation bill, which affects our armed services. None of us want to see our armed services and our defenses curtailed in any way. But I think that very fact points out the necessity of seeing to it that intelligent economies are effected in other directions. Certainly we know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has long been a zealous advocate of economy even in the armed services. I should like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to him and also to deplore the fact that we here in the House of Representatives may lose his services.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which has recently come to my attention which I would like to call to the attention of the House. Like a great many other Members of Congress, I practically only know what I read in the newspapers. Lately I have read this in the newspapers, that there is a move afoot, which may or may not be denied, to shift part of Great Britain's debt, amounting to \$9,000,000,000, which she owes to India, Pakistan, and southeastern Asia, to the United States. Undoubtedly we will soon have that brought to us as an accomplished fact. I believe it is a fine thing to pay the debts of our friends. I wish someone would pay mine. But I

submit to you it is a mistake to pay the debts of one's friend when that friend has a balanced budget and money in the bank when we, ourselves, are borrowing the money to finance ourselves as well as our friend.

Here is the story:

For the fiscal year ending March 31 in England they showed a balanced budget, with a surplus of \$1,537,000,000. For the next year, which began on April 1, Sir Stafford Cripps announced that he expected to end fiscal 1951 with a balanced budget and a surplus of \$1,240,000,000.

Now, it seems a little absurd, to say the least, when we are running at a deficit of, conservatively, \$6,000,000,000 a year, when we have been told by a very distinguished Member of the other body that we might expect to end fiscal 1951 with a deficit of \$14,000,000,000, that on top of all this we should assume the debts of a neighbor who is apparently solvent and apparently has some money in the bank. Surely this is not the way to economize. Surely this is not the way to go to the people of the United States and explain the necessity for more and heavier taxes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I congratulate the gentlewoman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. It seems to me that she has performed a real service in doing that. It is certainly my hope, as I feel sure it is the hope of the gentlewoman, that under the bipartisan arrangement which we have recently been told about, whereby members of our party will be called in at the outset to help plan some of the methods in the foreign countries, rather than having matters handed to them on a silver platter as accomplished facts, that great thought and study will be given and many deliberations entered into before any legislation is brought to us which requires us to assume a part of the debt of a country which is today balancing its own budget. I feel sure that the gentlewoman shares those views.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for the contribution. May I also hope that his statement will prove to be more than a pious hope and that this foreign policy will be conducted on patriotic and American lines throughout.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to say something about an old friend of mine of long standing, who has served upon this subcommittee for a great many years and who has done a wonderful job in promoting efficiency and economy in the armed services, the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. ALBERT ENGEL. I am sorry to say that he is retiring from the Congress. He is a candidate for

nomination and election as Governor of Michigan. I think he knows more about the armed services situation and matters that used to be tied up with the armed services in the appropriation work, the civil functions of the Army engineers, and other activities of that kind, than any other Member of the House. He has never hesitated to go out on long trips. We have reaped a great deal of benefit from his services. He found out many things that his fine business sense allowed him to correct.

I have asked for this time, this opportunity to speak, that I may pay my respects to him and wish him Godspeed and success in his ambitions and his every undertaking.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I join the gentleman in tribute to our colleague. I recall, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], on the Appropriations Committee making one of his famous one-man tours of the country for the sake of economy and efficiency was nearly killed as a result of an accident when a train struck his automobile. His courage in war and peace is well known to those of us who served with him. It has been said that as a result of his investigations and recommendations made by him to the Army saved the taxpayers of the United States more than a billion dollars, and that national defense was made more effective because his personal work and investigations were not only adopted, but they resulted in the elimination of obsolescence and brought about more effective national defense in all categories. His service to the country and the taxpayer can never be repaid. Is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I, too, had the pleasure of serving with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] not only on appropriations for the War Department, but was also delighted to have him join me as a joint member in a dual capacity on the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee.

I know of no man who has had a greater zeal, or more energy; or more profound knowledge of the armed forces. He has brought about a great deal of economy. I join the gentleman from New York in his good wishes and further say: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to join my good friend from New York in this tribute to one whom I regret very much is retiring from Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has won the admiration and affection of us all by his conscientious and splendid work. He has worked tirelessly to save the taxpayers' money and

to bring about a greater efficiency in Government. I know of no one who has made a more careful or praiseworthy investigation than Mr. ENGEL did several years ago when he uncovered graft, corruption, and mismanagement in some phases of our war work. It made for him a national reputation. I know from my own personal knowledge of no one in the country who has a better knowledge of the value of the development of our waterway system and flood controls than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. He has made a personal and careful investigation of every project. I wish to express my keen personal sorrow that he is retiring from Congress. He has served the country well. Our best wishes follow him.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As the gentleman from New York knows, he and I have served shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] over the years.

He has served as a member of the Subcommittee for Deficiency Appropriations. He has served as a member of the Subcommittee on the Armed Forces, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs, as a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor and Social Security.

He has been indefatigable in his work and has demonstrated great over-all capacity.

In my opinion, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has made a tremendous contribution in the fight to preserve the solvency of this Nation.

I deeply regret his present inclination to sever his connection with this body. I wish him every success and future happiness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the gentleman from New York and the others who have referred to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. Perhaps it would be more statesmanlike if I would refer to him as the Honorable ALBERT ENGEL, of Michigan.

We who have worked with you, Al, are going to miss your genial appearance and attitude very much. Wherever you go and whatever you do, we on this side of the aisle wish you all of the happiness and success possible.

May I also say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], we are also going to miss you gentlemen and we sincerely trust that whatever endeavors you take on in the future will result in prosperity and great happiness.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would be ungrateful indeed if I did not express my appreciation for the tributes that have been paid me by my beloved colleagues with whom I have worked during the past 16 years. Take away from me the friendship of the friends I have made on both sides of the aisle during the 16 years I served in Congress and you take from me the greatest remuneration I have received for that

service. Men serving in Congress and in public life are not paid with dollars, they are not always paid with public appreciation, but they must take their pay in the satisfaction of a job well done.

I thank each and every one of you from the bottom of my heart. God bless you all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, there are two aspects of this appropriation bill which I should like to discuss at this time—one of them has to do with the military appropriation and the other with the general method of dealing with the responsibility of Congress in appropriation of public funds. For the first time, the House has consolidated all of its appropriations into a single bill in the belief, entirely mistaken in my opinion, that by this method we can more effectively discharge our responsibilities in handling the public purse. We have been working on the measure for over 2 weeks now and find ourselves in a pathetic situation. Here we have a bill appropriating over \$29,000,000,000 dollars, a fantastic sum, certainly the largest single appropriation ever attempted by our Government or any other government in peacetime in all the history of the world. We are perplexed, bewildered, befuddled, and bemused; many of us completely despondent and discouraged in our efforts to deal with our responsibilities intelligently, effectively, and with the degree of economy so essential to national financial stability. This feeling of frustration is caused, in my opinion, entirely by the effort to wrap all the Government appropriation bills into one neat and pretty little package, in a package which consists of nearly 500 pages and weighs over a pound. Even the report accompanying the bill is a sizable tome which would run a close race with *Gone With the Wind* in number of words. The hearings upon which the bill is based consist of several volumes of testimony. It is impossible for any of us to act and vote intelligently. It is doubtful if even the members of the Appropriations Committee themselves are advised with respect to all provisions of this bill; in fact, I dare say that not a single member, even including the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member, knows in detail what this bill contains or the justification for the various items.

This novel idea has resulted in utter chaos and confusion; a complete lack of comprehension by the House generally as the bill is being jet-propelled along the legislative highway. The result has been a sort of lethargy, a complete defeatist-type of acceptance on practically everything the Committee on Appropriations has reported—in a supine acceptance of the fact that by the very nature of this process, the Appropriations Committee is given practically a dictatorial control over the deliberations of the House and the appropriation of public funds. What is even worse, this process fixes the situation so that the House, being completely confused, is not in a position to estimate the result of this dictation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my hope that this stupendous bill, this incomprehensible process, this befuddlement in matters of appropriations will not be repeated in the future, and so far as I am able, I shall as one Member of the House do whatever lies in my power to return our future budget deliberations to some degree of sanity and coherence. In fact, I am strongly of the opinion that the rules of the House should provide that appropriations for each department or agency of the Government be considered in a separate bill and that on each appropriation measure a record vote is required. It is my hope that the other members of the House who are so deeply concerned over the financial condition of our Government and who have made serious efforts, not only to understand the Federal budget and expenditures, but who have made serious efforts to pare expenditures to the bone, will join with me in that undertaking.

We have a strange situation on our hands. Already the budget is about \$6,000,000,000 out of balance and it is estimated that before the fiscal year is finished, there will be a deficit of over seven billion. There is not a single Member who thinks that this is desirable or healthy or conducive to the financial stability of Government except those few who subscribe to the fallacy voiced by some responsible officials of Government that deficit financing is wholesome to the national welfare. Unquestionably, the great majority of us would vote enthusiastically to balance the budget this minute, but why has this not been done. In my opinion, it is caused by a combination of factors—not the least of these is the propensity of this administration to gush dollars wildly and widely about as if they were water and about as plentiful. There is not the slightest doubt but that if solid conservatism got a firm hold of this budget process for even a brief period of time, hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars of waste could be found and eliminated. This has not been done and apparently will not be done despite the fact of general business prosperity.

Another reason why the budget is out of balance is the predilection of the administration to dash aimlessly and whimsically over the world exuding dollars by the millions to any and all nations that appear to be having a tough time balancing their own budgets—as is we were not. Not only is it the idea that our own unbalance is unimportant, but we follow the practice of providing the funds to others and then walking blithely away and expressing the pious hope that the millions thus granted will be expended by the foreign nations precisely as we had planned when we gave it to them.

The fact that that has not worked out time and time again, in practice, has been considered to be of no consequence. We are still doing it. And until reasonable conservatism, until reasonable people, until reasonable prudence and business sense, are returned to control of the Federal Treasury, this aimless program is bound to continue.

And that is another reason why the budget not only is out of balance now—but is sure to remain that way in the

future so long as a spendthrift administration stays in power.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what about the military phase of this appropriation bill? Here is another reason why the budget is in serious jeopardy. It is the perilous condition of the world today.

No matter how you approach the world situation, you end up at the hard core of the problem—the Soviet Union has dedicated herself to the destruction of our political and social system, and she is moving in all fields, with considerable success, toward the accomplishment of her goal.

The hard fact confronting us today is that, for an indefinite time in the future, we will find it necessary to maintain standing armed forces far in excess of any ever before even dreamed of by the American people in time of peace.

The fact is, that we have no alternative, if we prize our freedoms, if we wish our ideals and aspirations to take hold throughout the world, but to keep up American armed strength. For, if we fail to do so, our dividend will not be a balanced budget. Our dividend will be a destroyed America—an America destroyed by a war invited by American military weakness—and a war lost, after having been incited by that weakness, because of that weakness.

So, now I am referring directly and exclusively to the military budget itself. It amounts to almost \$13,000,000,000, a fantastically large sum of money. The question before the House is whether or not it provides adequate armed forces to meet conditions in today's world.

In my opinion, it does not. And here is why it does not.

Last year we appropriated money to support over 70,000 more men in the Navy than this bill authorizes. Last year we appropriated money to support almost 50,000 more men in the Army than is permitted by this bill. Last year we appropriated money to support 1,500 more active airplanes in the Navy and more fighting ships. And those appropriations, let me remind the Members of the House, were attuned to the international conditions existing at that time. But since last year we have had a whole succession of reverses—serious reverses throughout the world.

China is now in Russian hands. An army of 150,000 has been built up in eastern Germany. We have been warned that within a month, hostile demonstrations in Berlin will occur and we have announced to the world that these demonstrators will be resisted with our bullets. The strategic island of Hainan, which holds the key to the extremely important island of Formosa, has fallen to Russian minions.

Indochina is about to fall like a rotten apple to fanatics favorable to Russia and bitterly hostile to us. Next the effort will no doubt be Burma, perhaps India, perhaps the Dutch East Indies.

Russia has just killed 10 Americans by an unprovoked attack on an American Naval plane and we have been told that she would do it again. Russia has just demanded, in an insulting message, our removal from Trieste. Russia has built up the mightiest military force in the world—in submarines, in aircraft, in

armed manpower. That force is steadily growing.

Russia has exploded the atom bomb, although all of our leaders have predicted all the way along that she could not possibly master the atom until 1952 at the earliest. This event of incalculable military importance is now being laughed off by the very people who so earnestly have counseled the Congress for the last 4 years that we must peg all of our armed force planning on 1952 because of their expectation that Russia would have the atom bomb by then.

All this has come about since last year's military budget. But what, in the meantime, have we done in this so-called mightiest country in the world—I say, "so-called" because of what we have done in the past.

We have seen the President withhold \$736,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds which the Congress had provided to increase the Air Force from 48 to 58 air groups. We have seen the Secretary of Defense withhold \$234,000,000 more in aircraft procurement funds of the Air Force. We have seen the Secretary of Defense withhold \$123,000,000 in aircraft procurement funds for the Navy.

As Chairman VINSON said last April 4, we have seen over \$1,500,000,000 withheld from the fighting forces—all of which have been steadily declining since a year ago January so as to reach a predetermined low level of strength which the Appropriations Committee has simply accepted in this budget.

None of this program of inflicting injury on the effectiveness of our fighting forces received the approbation of the Congress.

We in the Congress are in a most peculiar position. We are daily warned by the Secretary of State that we must embark on what he calls "total diplomacy"—the complete resistance by the United States, including the maintenance of our military strength, to Soviet advance throughout the world. We are daily admonished by the President and Secretary of Defense that we must remain well prepared if we are to maintain peace in the world. We are daily warned by the military leaders of the Nation that failure to remain adequately prepared will not only bring on war, but will lose the war if it begins.

And, all the while, day in, day out, for months on end, we have been steadily reducing our military strength.

To my way of thinking, this situation is deplorable. It is playing fast and loose with the security of our Nation. It is intentionally misleading our people. It is confusion gone rampant in the highest councils of our Government.

So, what does this budget provide? It provides for the sharply reduced military strength Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the President have graciously decided to let the Congress provide. It is a budget that will, in effect, put the Congress in the position of kneeling to the "superior judgment" of those downtown who have ignored the previous decisions of the Congress in respect to the national defense. But, what else does it do? It asks the Congress to approve a program which will, as surely

as day follows night, compel a continuing reduction in naval and Air Force air strength in the future. So the idea is that we will reduce our military strength in the face of tremendous increases in Russian strength and despite great advances the Russian have made in strategic positions throughout the world. In addition, we will not make enough new airplanes available to our Navy and our Air Force to keep them from becoming obsolete in the next very few years.

Mr. Chairman, I draw the line there. I cannot let my eagerness for economy, my anxiety over the Nation's financial situation, my enthusiasm for a balanced budget, lead me to the decision that we can dispense with our future military power—especially in the air.

I cannot conceive of our approving a program here, as this bill provides, that will run the Air Force down to 42 groups—as the Appropriations Committee blandly admits. That is worse than false economy. This is saving today at the expense of tomorrow; it is a refusal to face the facts of today's world.

Neither can I conceive of our approving a program, as this bill would have us do, which strikes a mortal blow at our naval air arm which is the cutting edge of our modern fleet.

Here we are being asked by all our leaders to maintain our armed strength. So this bill comes along and says we need to have 48 groups in the Air Force. But we are told that the bill does not carry enough new planes to keep up 48 groups. Then we are again counseled, however, to maintain our armed strength in the future. Now just what sense does that make?

Next, we are told that the Navy must have 6,233 active aircraft. So the bill provides only enough new airplanes to maintain about 3,500 airplanes. The result is that, in the future, the naval air arm will be cut about in half in terms of modern aircraft. Meanwhile, the President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are shouting all over the United States that we must maintain our armed strength in the face of Russian intransigence.

Now, just what sense does that make?

I agree wholeheartedly, as I know this House does, that we must not economize at the expense of an adequate national defense. And this budget proposes the absolute minimum defense I can conceive under existing international conditions. If anything, it is too low, as recent events amply demonstrate.

That being true, I feel that there is the obligation on every Member of this House to support the increase necessary in the defense budget to maintain the limited air strength authorized by this bill.

I listened with extreme interest to the debate on this point of last April 4, between Chairman VINSON, of the House Armed Services Committee, and Chairman MAHON, of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services. In my opinion, the facts speak for themselves. The truth is that our air strength is certain to decline if we do not increase this budget—the required increase amounting to \$200,000,000 for the Air Force and \$383,000,000 for the

Navy. Since the committee has reduced the President's budget by over \$200,000,000, this amounts to an increase over the President's budget of the balance, or \$383,000,000. Since this argument occurred a month ago the Secretary of Defense has asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reappraise their military requirements in the light of present world conditions, and it has been announced that this measure is to be increased by \$350,000,000; \$200,000,000 for Air Force procurement, \$100,000,000 for Navy Air procurement, and \$50,000,000 for submarine construction and reconversion. To the extent that this amendment will correct the deficiency in our military requirements to which I have just made reference, we can all take added comfort.

However, the situation presents aspects which are still disturbing in that it apparently is essential for the people, through their Representatives in Congress, to insist upon a more adequate military machine than the administrators of the executive department whose judgment is dominated by economic considerations would allow us. Historically, until the past year or so, the military has asked for funds far in excess of the amount the public would give, and the Congress was required to pare military requests by varying degrees of reductions throughout the years. In the last year or so, including the appropriation for this year, the reverse is true, and the people, through Congress, have appropriated more than was sought for the military budget.

The proposed agreement to increase the appropriation by \$350,000,000 certainly should be supported by the House, for it does correct in a substantial measure a deficiency which might well have placed our national security in jeopardy. It is trite to say that we all hope war can be averted; that is the consuming passion of each one of us. We, as a nation, cannot place our national safety in jeopardy in a universal desire for peace. International brigandry is on the march today fully as much, if not more, than a decade ago. We were not prepared to meet that war then, much less to avert it. These experiences with two wars within our generation should provide some valuable lessons in international relations. Certainly, to my mind, they have established that the responsibility for world peace rests initially and largely upon America; that this responsibility cannot be met except through a strong Military Establishment.

It is, of course, deplorable that such vast sums should be diverted from creative purposes for the benefit of the general welfare and used for the wholly sterile purpose of national defense; however, we have no choice.

For my part, I prefer to retrench in public expenditures in every other way than, in the name of economy, to whittle down gradually our military forces until we become fully incapable of protecting our national interests.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this chapter of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, this concludes general debate on chapter X. General debate on chapter IX is now in order, not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] and 1 hour by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take this opportunity to review the history of the early waterway improvements and flood protection in this Nation.

To those who came adventuring to a new world, harbors were of the first importance and safe anchorage for their ships determined the location of their settlements. The natural channels were deep enough for their small vessels, so little or nothing in the way of improvement was attempted before the Revolutionary War; and, for a good many years thereafter, it was the established practice for States to improve their harbors from funds raised by tonnage dues, and so forth.

For more than two hundred years after the first settlers landed on our shores, the rivers were the principal highways, just as they had been for unknown thousands of years on the other continents of the earth. These first settlers found the country covered with a vast unbroken forest. It was inevitable, therefore, when the westward movement of population began, that the line of march should go first up the rivers flowing into the Atlantic and then down those flowing to the Lakes and the Mississippi. Washington made repeated journeys from the Potomac to the Ohio, which, of all the westward-flowing streams, was the one most largely used.

In the early days of the Government it was seriously doubted that the power to regulate comprehended the right to improve; in other words, was the improvement of rivers and harbors a matter of national concern and therefore subject to appropriation under the Constitution? However, as early as the first Congress an act was passed providing for the future support and maintenance at Federal expense of lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and public piers; and for rendering the navigation of bays, harbors, and ports easy and safe. Thereafter, appropriations were made from time to time for the construction and placing of these facilities.

During the early decades of the nineteenth century, civilization spread swiftly along the natural waterways and from them into the wilderness through a spreading network of canals. By this time Congress had extended its jurisdiction to the granting of Federal aid in the building of canals. The first major canal was the Erie Canal, which was opened to through navigation from Buffalo to the Hudson in 1825. Its success was so great that canal projects sprang up on every hand.

In 1809 Congress appropriated \$25,000 for extending the Carondelet Canal from

Lake Pontchartrain to the Mississippi River and for making it "sufficiently deep throughout to admit an easy and safe passage of gunboats." This was not only the first direct appropriation for canal construction but was the only one made by the Government before the Civil War. However, between 1825 and 1830, Congress subscribed the following amounts to the stock of private canal companies: Louisville and Portland, \$100,000; Chesapeake and Delaware, \$200,000; Dismal Swamp, \$283,500; Chesapeake and Ohio, \$1,000,000.

Congress also aided in other ways besides subscription to the stock of private companies. In 1824 grants of land to aid in canal construction and river improvements were made to a number of States—including Alabama, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin—and, under this and other acts, nearly 4,500,000 acres of land were granted specifically for the construction of canals. One of the most important grants to the States was through an act passed in 1836, providing for the "deposit" with the States of surplus funds then in the Treasury. A high tariff and the rapid increase in the sale of public lands had created the surplus; and \$37,000,000 was so distributed before the panic of 1837 caused the surplus to disappear.

Rapid settlement of the United States and the destruction of forests primeval and the intense cultivation of our soils brought about the necessity for flood control and the protection of our many fertile soils as well as the creation of electric power to implement the progress and welfare of mankind.

Congress initiated improvements for the benefit of navigation by the act approved May 24, 1824, which provided for improvements in the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

The act of June 28, 1879, created the Mississippi River Commission and directed the Commission to mature plans for navigation, bank protection, and to protect against destructive floods. Appropriations were made regularly for the work recommended by the Commission, and improvements were made in the river between the mouth of the Ohio River and the Head of the Passes.

The Flood Control Act of March 1, 1917, adopted a project for flood-control improvement on the Sacramento River, Calif. This act authorized appropriations in the sum of \$45,000,000 for controlling floods in the Mississippi River and \$5,600,000 for similar improvements in the Sacramento River.

The River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927, and the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, authorized surveys to be made of the principal river valleys of the country with a view to improvement for navigation, flood control, power, and irrigation. The reports submitted in response to these provisions form the basis for many of the projects for flood control that either have been completed or are under construction.

The Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, authorized appropriations in the sum of \$325,000,000 for the Mississippi River and \$17,600,000 for the Sacramento River.

The Flood Control Act of May 22, 1936, adopted the general policy now in effect—that the Federal Government should improve navigable waters or their tributaries for flood-control purposes if the benefits that may accrue are in excess of the costs.

The Flood Control Act of May 22, 1936, as amended and modified by the act of June 28, 1938, provided "that penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission."

The benefits to be derived from river-and-harbor improvements and flood-control programs have been carefully and fully explained to the Congress and the country as authorizing legislation has been considered and enacted. A great amount of such work was authorized and completed prior to 1938 when the above-quoted provision of law was enacted. The justification for the legislation at the time of its enactment was and is well understood by Members of the Congress.

Since the above basic principles became law, events of world-wide importance have disclosed the tremendous value of the programs inaugurated and completed prior to our entrance into World War II. Industrial capacity, increased largely through hydroelectric power generated under these programs, made victory possible. Since World War II the Congress, being apprised of shortages, enacted the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act under which it is the policy of the Government to acquire and retain stocks of critical materials and to conserve and develop the sources of these materials within the United States.

In the light of experience and current events what could be more important to the welfare of the Nation than the stockpiling of hydroelectric energy? What can be more critical than the need for power in times of emergency? Of what value are many of the critical raw materials acquired under the Stock Piling Act without the power to process them?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that one of the most critical items at any time, and especially in time of emergency, is power. The millions of acre-feet of water withheld from flood crests and stored behind Government-built dams is power. The harnessing of this natural resource within the streams of the Nation is, to me, one of the most important programs of stock piling of resources it is possible for this Nation to pursue. It provides the additional energy so necessary in our industrial age for needs during normal times and so essential in times of emergency. It augments the industrial capacity of this Nation, which is the most feared of our resources in times of emergency. It is one item that can be stockpiled during normal times that will repay its cost to the economy of the Nation, and without which the Nation, if deprived of its benefits, may not survive in an emergency. Let us not overlook

this essential item as we plan for this and future generations.

Now, with reference to the bill before us, the action of the committee on civil functions is summarized clearly in the last line of the tabulation appearing on page 263 of the committee report. The chapter on civil functions contains a total of \$632,620,000, representing a decrease of \$31,634,190 under the appropriations for the current year, and a reduction of \$202,247,500 in the budget estimates.

The largest item is for work of the Corps of Engineers in connection with flood control and rivers and harbors activities for which the chapter includes \$600,945,000. This represents a decrease of \$34,559,190 under the current year's appropriation and a reduction of \$197,537,000 in the budget estimates.

The chapter contains no new projects either budgeted or unbudgeted. While the reductions in the budget estimates submitted for the individual projects are, in most instances, substantial, I wish to state that, in the judgment of the committee, the amounts recommended are considered adequate to keep the projects current. The fiscal year 1950 bill for this activity did not become law until October 13, 1949. As a result of this delay in the enactment of legislation, the engineers in the majority of cases lost what might be considered as one construction season. This is borne out by the reported large unobligated balances for nearly all of the projects appropriated for in fiscal year 1950. The committee took cognizance of these balances in recommending appropriations for the fiscal year 1951. There seemed to be no advantage, either to the Federal Government or to the individual project, in appropriating funds which could not be used perhaps until the summer of 1951. In some instances none of the fiscal year 1950 funds were reported obligated as of the time of the hearings. In a great number of instances only small portions of the funds were obligated. The committee did not make a percentage reduction, but considered each project on the basis of the stage of construction and the amount of money presently available for each project.

A small number of projects have been eliminated from the bill because either they should be completed with funds heretofore appropriated, as agreed to in conference last year, or because the total estimated Federal cost was increased over that given the committee when construction was initiated.

With respect to this matter of increasing total Federal cost, I wish to say that the committee could find no justification for increased Federal cost because of increases in unit costs during the past year. The Engineers, in a majority of instances, have submitted increased Federal cost estimates because of subsequent changes in engineering and structural design. While some such changes are generally accepted as inevitable, the committee is of the opinion that the variations in the estimates of the engineers have been too great. It is hoped that these changes could be greatly re-

duced by more careful planning before beginning construction.

For the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, the chapter includes \$65,000,000, which is only \$2,000,000 less than is available for the current year. The majority of the committee did not feel that a further reduction in this item was in order.

The committee has eliminated all funds requested for planning. The impression gathered by the committee is that the engineers have over the past few years concentrated too heavily on individual projects with the resultant submerging of the over-all plans for both flood control and rivers and harbors. The action of the committee will give both the Congress and the engineers an opportunity to take stock of the present program and speed this program to completion before proceeding with the construction of new projects.

The remaining items in the chapter are more or less routine.

I do not subscribe to the serious criticism of our Army engineers who, under the law, are required to pass upon the projects involving flood control and rivers and harbors improvements—they are human beings and make some mistakes as all other humans do. For a number of years I have contacted these Army officers and I am convinced that no organization could be perfected which could do this important work better than those officers educated and trained by this Government for such purposes. If you will turn to the list of these fine officials within the last 10 years, this important duty has been placed upon Maj. Gen. Julian L. Schley, Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, and Col. William E. Potter, Acting Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. In my opinion, no ulterior motives were ever involved by these gentlemen or the others who were designated for this work. They have attempted to do a good job and this Nation owes them a debt of gratitude inestimable.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We all appreciate the splendid speech that the gentleman from North Carolina made on this chapter of the appropriation bill. I want to congratulate him on the fine and excellent service that he has rendered his district, his State, and his Nation throughout his long tenure of service.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate deeply the gentleman's expression.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman pointed out that there were no funds available in this bill for new construction. Does that apply also to planning funds and to engineering and surveying funds?

Mr. KERR. Both; to any and all new construction.

Mr. PRIEST. No funds for either planning or construction? I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some excerpts from a statement I made before the Senate committee yesterday, and also from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I arise to appeal to the Congress, first, from a standpoint of national defense and, second, from a standpoint of our internal water transportation system, to support the amendments that will be offered for funds to speed-up the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway—the missing link in our national defense program—as well as the missing link in our internal waterway system.

We cannot afford to wait until our sleeping cities are awakened by the terrible music of the bursting bomb, as was done in the case of Pearl Harbor. The very safety of our Nation may depend upon the speedy construction of this short slack-water route. It will cut the water distance between the Gulf of Mexico and our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., by more than 800 miles, cut the cost of transportation between the Gulf and Oak Ridge from 50 to 75 percent, and provide an additional outlet to the sea from that great project in case of emergency.

The enemies of this vital construction, led by the railroad lobbyists, who are opposed to all water transportation, continue to tell you they do not want to start any new projects.

This is not a new project.

It is an extension of our present national defense program. It is an extension of our facilities of access to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., the greatest defense project the world has ever known and the one on which America must rely for her security and protection in case of another conflict.

In other words, it is a part of our defense program that must be constructed sooner or later, and should be constructed now with all possible haste.

Remember that, as General Wheeler pointed out, this project was not feasible until Pickwick Dam was built in 1938, raising the water level on the Tennessee by 54 feet, which made it possible to cut through the sand ridge that separates the two streams and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River.

It is absolute nonsense to be sending billions of dollars of the American taxpayer's money abroad under the pretense of strengthening our national defense, and at the same time refusing this small appropriation to build this channel of ingress and egress to and from our atomic-bomb plant, which in case of another conflict will be worth more to us than all the billions of dollars this country could possibly send abroad.

Pouring those billions of the taxpayers' money into foreign countries and then refusing the small amount necessary to

complete this short, necessary passage to and from our atomic-bomb plant is like straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

We cannot afford to dilly-dally along until it is too late.

General Wheeler told us, when he was Chief of Army Engineers, that the construction of this project providing this short slack-water route from the Gulf to our atomic-bomb plant at Oak Ridge was absolutely necessary to our national defense. If any of you doubt the wisdom of that statement, look at this map, which I am going to place out in the hall for the Members to examine at any time they desire to do so.

This is not a new project, so far as our internal waterway system is concerned, for it is an extension or a completion, of developments which have been going on for years and years and years.

It is an extension of that transportation system on the Ohio River, as well as on the Monongahela and the Allegheny, where we have constructed 68 locks and dams; 47 on the Ohio, 13 on the Monongahela, and 8 on the Allegheny. The traffic on those streams is now bottled up, so far as its connection with the Gulf of Mexico is concerned, for the want of this slack water route for the returning traffic, which this project will provide, and still save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream shipments.

Again, I say it is not a new project, for the reason that it is an extension of our transportation system on the Great Lakes and the upper Mississippi, where we have constructed 7 locks and dams on the Illinois River, to provide transportation to and from the Great Lakes, and where we have constructed 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi, to provide transportation to and from cities along that great stream, such as La Crosse, Minneapolis, and St. Paul, and all other points along the Mississippi from Minneapolis and St. Paul to New Orleans, La., and on to the mouth of the stream.

Again, I say it is not a new project, for the reason that it is an extension of those developments on the Missouri River, the Arkansas, and along the Intracoastal Waterway from the west coast of Florida to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border.

Again, I say it is not a "new" project, for the reason that it is an extension of that development which has been going on along the Tombigbee, the Tennessee, and the Warrior Rivers for the last 30 years.

This project is already authorized by law. It has been approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. We have spent \$858,000 on the planning, which is, as the Chief of Army Engineers expressed it, "substantially complete." They are ready now to move forward with its construction, and rush it to a speedy conclusion.

The Demopolis Dam, which the Chief of Army Engineers said the other day is the "connecting link" between this project and the Gulf, is already under construction, and should be completed as quickly as possible.

In addition to its benefits to the Nation as a whole from a standpoint of national defense, as well as from a standpoint of transportation, let me show you the water frontages of the various States which this project will directly serve.

ILLINOIS

In order to show what this project will mean to the people of Illinois, let me call your attention to the fact that the State of Illinois will have 1,097 miles of water frontage which this project will serve—581 miles along the Mississippi River, 133 miles along the Ohio, 326 miles along the Illinois, and 57 miles along the shore of Lake Michigan.

This project will be worth untold millions, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars to the people of Illinois; and, remember, they will not be merely temporary benefits, but benefits that will last throughout the centuries to come.

OHIO

Now let us see what it will mean to the State of Ohio.

That State will have 451 miles along the Ohio River, 27 miles along the Wabash, and 182 miles along Lake Erie, which this project will serve. It is impossible to estimate the great benefits which a slack-water route from the Gulf to the Ohio River and the Great Lakes, of which this project will be the completing link—it is impossible to estimate what it will mean to the people of Ohio in the years to come.

INDIANA

Take the State of Indiana, with 350 miles along the Ohio River, 40 miles of shore line along Lake Michigan, and more than 200 miles along the Wabash, all to be served by the slack-water route from the Gulf to the Great Lakes, of which this project will be the completing link.

Who can estimate the benefits which the people of that State will derive from this development, which, as I said, will provide a slack-water route for their returning traffic, and, at the same time, save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream shipments.

PENNSYLVANIA

It is utterly impossible to overestimate the benefits which the great State of Pennsylvania will derive from the construction of this project. Pennsylvania not only has a large stretch of frontage on the Ohio, as well as on the Monongahela and the Allegheny, but she has a frontage of 44 miles on Lake Erie, all of which would be served by this project.

One of those vast 14,000-ton barges, or tows of barges, that are now going down the Ohio and the Mississippi, carrying the finished products from the Pittsburgh area, would save more than \$22,000 on its fuel bill alone by returning through this slack water route, of which this project will be the completing link.

KENTUCKY

It is useless to dwell on the benefits which this great project would bring to the State of Kentucky. As everyone knows, the Tennessee River joins the Ohio at Paducah, and the Ohio touches

the boundary of the State of Kentucky for 664 miles.

This development would provide what would virtually amount to a slack water route all the way from the Gulf at Mobile to Paducah, as well as to all points on the Ohio River, which, as I said, touches the boundary of Kentucky for 664 miles.

WEST VIRGINIA

The people of West Virginia would greatly benefit by this project. The Ohio touches the boundary of that State by 277 miles, and the Monongahela, which joins the Allegheny at Pittsburgh, flows through the State of West Virginia.

Every barge, and every vessel, that goes down the Ohio, or the Monongahela, from West Virginia to the Gulf would enjoy the benefits of this slack water route for its return.

It may be of interest to the Members of the House to know that in 1948 the traffic on the Monongahela River exceeded that of the Panama Canal by more than 6,000,000 tons. This project would stimulate that traffic, as well as the traffic on the Ohio River, which exceeded that of the Panama Canal in 1948 by more than 16,000,000 tons—this project, as I said, would stimulate that traffic by providing a slack-water route for returning vessels that carry the products of that area to the Southern States or to the Gulf of Mexico to be shipped to foreign countries.

MICHIGAN

Michigan is one of the States that is shipping a large portion of her finished products down the Ohio and the Mississippi by barges. She would have a total of 1,564 miles of water frontage to be served by this project.

When these barges return they want to bring back raw materials, such as oil, lumber, cottonseed meal and hulls, salt, sulfur, bauxite, iron ore, sea food, and other materials needed by the people of that State to carry on the great industrial enterprises which they have developed. This project would do more to aid in that respect than anything else that has ever been proposed.

MISSOURI

This project would be worth more to the State of Missouri than any other development of its kind that has ever been suggested. Missouri has 495 miles frontage on the Mississippi River and 570 miles frontage on the Missouri River, or a total of 1,065 miles of frontage that this project will serve. Yet the people of Missouri have their traffic bottled up, because returning vessels must fight that swift current of the Mississippi River. And besides they are paying a one-way freight rate that is literally bleeding them white.

I do not hesitate to say that if this proposition were left to a vote of the people of Missouri, and they were given to understand just what it means to them, there would not be enough votes against it to count. It would carry virtually unanimously.

If the enemies of this project succeed in blocking it, they will have done the State of Missouri, as well as all the other

States in that great basin from Pennsylvania to Montana, the greatest possible injury.

IOWA

Take the State of Iowa, which is one of the richest agricultural States in the Union. We find her traffic bottled up and her people punished with a one-way freight rate that is literally draining the resources and retarding the prosperity of that great Commonwealth.

Iowa has 312 miles frontage on the Mississippi River and 190 miles frontage on the Missouri River, or a total of 502 miles which this project would serve. The Mississippi is already navigable, and we are moving forward with developments on the Missouri River to make that stream navigable as rapidly as we can and as far up as possible.

This project would be a godsend to the people of Iowa in enabling them to bring back the materials they need, and to use the swift current of the Mississippi and Missouri for the downstream shipment of their products to the markets of the world.

MINNESOTA—WISCONSIN

Here are two States that will benefit immeasurably by this project. Minnesota has 150 miles of frontage on Lake Superior and 180 miles on the Mississippi River. Wisconsin has 350 miles frontage on Lakes Michigan and Superior, and 230 miles frontage on the Mississippi River.

As I have pointed out before, we have built 26 locks and dams on the upper Mississippi River, in order to provide a navigable channel all the way up to Minneapolis and St. Paul. Those people can ship their products down the Mississippi River with all ease, and at a minimum of expense. But when they start back and have to fight the swift current of the Mississippi River all the way up to Cairo, Ill., it eats up their profits and makes it impossible for them to enjoy the great benefits which the easy, rapid, downstream course of the Mississippi provides. But if they had this slack-water route for their returning traffic, it would be worth untold millions—yes; hundreds of millions of dollars—to the people of those two States in the years to come.

KANSAS—NEBRASKA

The same thing may be said of both Kansas and Nebraska. Kansas has 128 miles frontage on the Missouri River, and Nebraska has 415 miles frontage on that stream. Both States are being penalized by a one-way freight rate, and as a result are unable to get their products to market without the burden of unnecessary expense. This project will enrich every individual in those States—not only now but for centuries to come.

SOUTH DAKOTA—NORTH DAKOTA—MONTANA

This project will be of great benefit also to the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana as we develop the Missouri River which flows through them.

South Dakota alone has 547 miles of frontage on the Missouri. North Dakota and Montana each have a similar frontage on the upper stretches of that stream.

It is impossible to estimate the benefits which the people of those States will derive from the completion of this miss-

ing link in this great inland waterway system.

It is useless to further enumerate the States which this project will benefit. Even the State of New York has 280 miles of shore line along Lakes Erie and Ontario that this project would serve, since it would be available to all traffic on the Great Lakes; and if and when the connection is finally made between the Ohio River and the Great Lakes, either through the Beaver-Mahoning or the Allegheny route, this project will be of double importance to the people of western New York, as well as to the people along the Erie Canal.

I might point out also, that it will be of benefit to every State along the Atlantic seaboard that is now being reached by the Intracoastal Waterway, which we hope to connect with the Gulf intracoastal waterway, and thereby facilitate transportation of traffic from one section of the country to the other.

All the States on those streams, and the ones on the Intracoastal Waterway,

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.....	Cairo.....	\$28,280	\$18,480	\$9,800
	Paducah.....	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	33,880	13,800	20,080
Mobile, Ala.....	Cairo.....	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah.....	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.....	Cairo.....	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah.....	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.....	Cairo.....	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah.....	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.....	Cairo.....	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah.....	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.....	Cairo.....	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah.....	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	45,920	1,820	44,100
Amory, Miss.....	Cairo.....	40,740	6,160	34,580
	Paducah.....	41,860	5,320	36,540
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	46,340	1,540	44,800
Fulton, Miss.....	Cairo.....	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah.....	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction.....	46,620	1,120	45,500

Remember that the savings up to Cairo, Ill., apply to every load of traffic going to any point above Cairo on the Mississippi, Illinois, the Great Lakes, and the Missouri, and that the savings back to Paducah apply to all the traffic going up the Ohio and its tributaries.

I have gone into this proposition somewhat at length, in order to try to impress the Congress with the dire necessity of speeding up the construction of this short, missing link in our national defense program which, as I said, is also the missing link in our internal waterway system.

We cannot afford to delay it any longer.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am bothered somewhat by this entire chapter. I have tried to find justification for many of the items, but have been unsuccessful. Rivers and harbors traditionally is the repository of the so-called pork barrel in our Government ex-

from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Brownsville, Tex., from Knoxville, Tenn., to Sioux City, Iowa, and beyond, from Minneapolis and St. Paul to New Orleans and Mobile, will benefit directly from this development, as well as all the other States whose tributaries flow into those streams and into the Gulf of Mexico.

A barge or a tow of barges can go from Pittsburgh, Pa., or from Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Paul, or any other point along the Great Lakes, or along the streams I have mentioned, all the way down to the Gulf and along the Intracoastal Waterway to the west coast of Florida, or to Brownsville, Tex., on the Mexican border, but when they start back they are penalized because of the lack of this connection which would provide a slack-water route for their returning traffic.

Here is a table showing what those 14,000-ton barges, or tow of barges, would save by returning through this slack-water route instead of fighting the swift current of the Mississippi:

penditures. I think all of us realize, too, that pork barrel is a symbol of waste and congressional extravagance. Pork barrel means cynicism and indifference toward economy.

Too much lip service is given to economy and not enough action. There is no person today who does not recognize that our national resources and the amount the Government can spend are limited. Pork barrel benefits only a few and not the Nation as a whole.

We are faced today with a dangerous cold war which has taken large amounts of money from every person in the United States. We are also faced with a budget that is sadly out of balance and our national deficit is increasing every day. There is no prospect for a tax decrease.

This Nation cannot continue to survive in health and strength by financing everything we want through borrowings. Deficit financing can lead only to a weakening of our economic system and ultimately to a loss of our democratic leadership.

People of this country want to have confidence in their Congress. They want to know that Congress understands that there is not enough money for everything. The people certainly understand it.

The pork-barrel politics is impossible to defend. The items listed for these millions of important dollars can be done without and we know it. The waters in these rivers and harbors can flow many more years without these improvements. At best, such expenditures should wait upon a better budget picture and a more healthy tax structure.

The people of this country cannot be asked to have faith and confidence in us if we are not prepared to discriminate among the possible ways of spending their money.

Let us strike "pork" from the appropriation. Let us have the moral courage to be economical. Let us give birth to a new confidence and sanity in our judgment. The country will approve this contribution to a strong and stable economy.

I have heard the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee talk about the part the rivers have played in America. Historically, I suppose that is true. I suppose, too, that all over America there are thousands upon thousands of rivers that are crying for a dam, and many harbors, probably, crying to be deepened, but we do have the railroads and we do have the roads.

I should like to address a few questions to the gentlemen of the subcommittee, be it on this side of the aisle or the other. These questions come about because of being unable to find within the hearings or the report the justification for some of these expenditures.

On page 249 of the report there is listed a figure of \$2,780,284,270 as the estimated total cost of all Government projects excluding flood-control projects now under construction. How firm is this figure? Has there been any increase over the original estimates of these projects? Will somebody please enlighten me?

Mr. KERR. Those were the estimates of the Corps of Engineers, and they were thoroughly gone over.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I called the Corps of Engineers a few times to try to get answers to these questions. I was told I could not get the justifications because there were four copies of the justifications, and those justifications were in the hands of the subcommittee and were not available to me.

I thereupon called the assistant clerk of the committee and he told me that he could not give me the justifications.

We here in this Congress are asked to vote for these projects. These projects are in 33 States. There is great doubt all over America concerning the wisdom of these projects. The least that can be expected if we are going to vote intelligently upon these measures is to have the justifications for these projects. Certainly it is no answer to say that we can get them from the Army engineers, because I tried.

Mr. TABER. May I suggest to the gentleman that on page 379 of the hearings is a table that runs two or three pages,

which shows the original estimated cost of the projects considered. The gentleman will note that in some cases the original estimated cost is 20 percent of the current estimated cost.

I call attention at the moment to one project picked at random. The original estimated cost was \$3,350,000. That is the Whitney Reservoir, listed on page 382. The present estimated cost is \$41,794,000.

We have had estimates of the cost jumped as high as 100 percent from the bill that was put through here in 1949 to the bill that is presently being considered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Under those circumstances, does not the gentleman believe we are being led down a very dangerous blind alley when we approve a project that is represented to cost approximately \$8,000,000, and we get started on the project and find when we get through that the project will cost \$41,000,000? That is not good business, it is not good government, and it certainly is not sound practice or economy.

Mr. TABER. It is not keeping faith with the Congress by the Corps of Engineers, either.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is exactly the point I want to make. If the Corps of Engineers is coming in here to justify their point of view and estimate \$8,000,000, and then have a cost of \$41,000,000, I think instead of hearing praise for the Corps of Engineers, the Corps of Engineers should explain why they are so far off in their estimates.

Mr. TABER. That is what we have tried to find out. We have been unable to find good reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee for five additional minutes?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Will the gentleman on the other side of the aisle yield me five additional minutes?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have some pertinent questions to which I think it is important to have the answers.

Are there any projects under construction not included in this figure on page 249 of approximately \$2,750,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean the projects on page 379 that I referred to?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. I am looking at the projects listed on page 250. On page 249 of the report there is this statement:

The total estimated Federal cost of the rivers and harbors projects presently under construction is reported at \$2,780,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Those, of course, are rivers and harbors projects. They are separate from the flood-control projects.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I understand. I am only asking concerning the rivers and harbors projects.

Mr. TABER. As I understand it, those figures cover the total of the presently authorized rivers and harbors projects on which appropriations have been made to start construction. I do not have the page marked where the comparative

table appears to which I referred the gentleman on flood control, but there is a table and I will give the page number to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Does this figure represent the average yearly value of projects under construction year in and year out, from the experience of the gentleman in the House? Does this figure of approximately \$2,750,000,000 represent the average yearly value of projects under construction?

Mr. TABER. No. We have rather increased the value of the projects under construction from year to year. Some of these tremendous increases have come in the projects on the Missouri River. That is, some big increases have come in the projects on the Missouri River and some in the State of Washington. I am being somewhat general and am referring to projects on rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. RIBICOFF. On page 250 of the report is listed a number of projects to which have been allocated the total sum of \$187,678,000. One hundred five million eight hundred and thirty-eight thousand dollars is for the purpose of continuing projects under way. Do I understand that is the entire construction allotment necessary to have these projects proceed during the coming fiscal year? Is that all the money which will be used on these projects during the coming fiscal year for construction purposes?

Mr. TABER. Not necessarily. All of this money which is appropriated is made available to the engineers until expended. That has been the practice for generations. During the last couple of years, and I might state frankly to the gentleman that my service and the service of the other members of the subcommittee, with the exception of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], on this subcommittee only dates back to last year, but we have tried in the last year to find out what the unexpended and unobligated balances were before we made our appropriations and we considered the projects on that basis. This year we made the discovery for the first time that they were boosting the costs of these projects, and so we have gone into the thing much more thoroughly than we ever have before, and we have had to discriminate against projects where the estimate of costs has been boosted out of sight.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This sounds very close to dishonesty in figures. How much money does the Army Engineer Corps now have where funds have been appropriated and unexpended?

Mr. TABER. I do not have that figure at hand. We had it by individual projects. I do not have that at hand.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Does the gentleman mean unobligated funds with respect to rivers and harbors and flood control?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; with respect to rivers and harbors and flood control.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. As of December 31, it was approximately \$220,000,000.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it sound, when the Army engineers have on hand \$220,000,000 unexpended, that at the same time we vote them another \$187,000,000 that

probably will be unexpended? Certainly, with the deficit that we are running at the present time, could we not find better use for the current funds?

Mr. TABER. That is one reason why these appropriation figures in this bill are cut as much as they are. It was because there were such enormous unexpended balances. I have a table before me now which relates to rivers and harbors. On pages 190 and 191 is the detailed break-down of the original estimated cost and the present estimated cost of rivers and harbors projects. One of them I will refer to. The Chief Joseph Dam was estimated at \$104,000,000 in 1945, and at the present time the estimated cost is \$206,000,000. It has only gone up approximately 100 percent. I might be exaggerating a little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I say this with a feeling of humility. This is my first term and perhaps I should not be asking these questions, but certainly it is shocking to find out—

Mr. TABER. If it shocks you, you can be sure it shocked me tremendously, because I had always been brought up to have a great deal of faith in what the Army engineers might do. I have been terribly disappointed, I will say to the gentleman, in what I have found in the 2 years I have served on this subcommittee.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think probably it would be well for the country if there were perhaps more of us in this Congress that might be shocked by such financial shenanigans.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, I will give the totals of those figures on page 191. The original estimates of cost were \$1,747,000,000. The present estimates are \$2,780,000,000. For those same projects the estimates last year were \$1,974,000,000—more than 50 percent up in the last year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Which of the projects listed on page 250 of the report could be stopped this year without economic loss to the project?

Mr. TABER. Well, there are not very many that could be stopped without loss. I would say that there were not very many projects that could be stopped without serious loss. In this approach it has not been a partisan approach in the slightest degree. I will say that the Members on the majority side and the Members on the minority side have pretty well agreed.

There is one item that I think is larger than justified, but outside of that I would say that we were pretty well set on what this bill should carry; it represents very substantial cuts.

Mr. RIBICOFF. This year Congress has authorized \$1,453,414,300 for new projects.

Mr. TABER. No, no.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Authorized but not appropriated.

Mr. TABER. We have done neither. The bill has passed both houses and a conference report lies on the table. I

understand it will be brought up tomorrow. Frankly, I cannot support it.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I will join the gentleman in that.

May I say to the gentleman from New York that if this conference report were adopted how eventually would these items be brought into the swollen sum being spent under the so-called rivers and harbors bill here?

Mr. TABER. They would come in on budget estimates from the President; then the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate would hold hearings, and they would recommend action on those budget estimates, either approving them, disapproving them, or modifying the projects after they had held their hearings.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But this year, as I understand, the Committee on Appropriations has not appropriated any funds whatsoever for additional new projects.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I ask whether this is a policy of the Appropriations Committee to continue to cut back appropriations for new projects until we have a better budget picture?

Mr. TABER. That is my personal position. I think it would hardly do for a minority member to speak for the full committee. I would say that from all I can gather it is the attitude of the majority of the subcommittee that has been involved in this.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Would that be a fair question to put to the majority members of the committee? Whether it is the intent and policy of the committee to discontinue any appropriations for new projects until we have a better budget picture?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. RABAUT. It has certainly been the views of the committee, as is evidenced by the report that comes up to the House from which the gentleman is quoting.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think the committee should be commended for the action it is taking, because that is what the public expects of this Congress, good faith.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will study the report of this subcommittee he will find, I believe, that it tops the list for respect for the purse of Uncle Sam.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In that respect it should be commended. I think it is unfortunate that the report did not contain justification of these projects and some of the answers to the questions that I raised.

(Mr. RIBICOFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut did not have time to yield for a couple of questions.

Let me state at the outset that I do not profess to know anything about the pork barrel contained in these various projects, but it seems to me that the gentleman's general statement criticizing the Army engineers for their varying estimates on the total cost of these projects is altogether without any basis. The projects should be judged individually from the standpoint of value. As I understand, the money the engineers have on hand, which was referred to in colloquy between the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is all earmarked for certain projects and must be used to complete those specific projects. It may be that there are some projects in this bill that should not have been commenced, but the question presented here is obtaining money to complete projects where the Government in many instances has made a huge investment. Of course the engineers' estimates on many of these projects varied from time to time on account of increased cost in construction. In many instances there were unforeseen circumstances that made the project cost more than originally estimated.

Now, if the gentleman from Connecticut will turn to page 253 of the report, he will find a statement of the committee that says:

In view of the fact that unit costs on construction have remained more or less stable since that period—

Talking about the previous year—

the committee feels that these projects should be completed on the basis of the fiscal year 1950 estimates.

Let us analyze this one statement that appears in the committee report for the purpose of seeing how it affects the Dewey Reservoir, a recreation and flood-control project located in my congressional district in eastern Kentucky, and for the purpose of seeing whether or not this is a sound statement in the committee report. The Army engineers in their 1950 estimate estimated the total cost of the Dewey Reservoir to be \$6,246,800. Congress has appropriated approximately \$6,000,000 for this project. This year the engineers appeared before the committee and stated that they needed more than a million dollars to complete the project.

At the time the engineers gave their testimony before the Appropriations Committee they were laboring under the impression that the acquisition of lands for this reservoir would cost more than \$1,000,000 over their previous estimate for the budget year 1950. About August 1948, when the estimate was made for the 1950 budget, very few, if any, condemnation suits pending in the Federal court had been tried. Thirty to thirty-five percent of the entire acreage in this reservoir area had to be obtained through condemnation proceedings. If I recall correctly, the first few condemnation cases tried exceeded by far the original estimates allowed for the value of the land in the 1950 budget, on account of the fluctuation in land values. On the basis of these awards the engineers in the fall of 1949 increased their

estimates on the total cost of this project to more than a million dollars. That amount was provided for in the budget.

No one can say that the engineers were not justified in increasing their total estimate in this instance. A few weeks ago the engineers arrived at the conclusion that it would take only \$600,000 to complete this project. Since August, 1949 agreements have been reached in several condemnation suits and the engineers have been in a better position to appraise all the individual tracts of land necessary to acquire than they were 6 months ago. There has been less fluctuation and variation in real estate values.

All of the construction on this particular project has been completed for some time but this additional money is to acquire land in order to hold the floodwaters before the project can be fully utilized. Yet the Appropriations Committee has denied the amount of money that it will take to complete the project, and are holding the engineers to the estimate of total cost they made for the 1950 budget.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not know about the particular project to which the gentleman refers, but when the original estimates were made, was it not known by the Army engineers you would have to have additional work in order to properly complete that dam?

Mr. PERKINS. I will answer the gentleman in this way: The original estimate in 1950 was made for \$6,246,800 as the total cost. At that time they were unable to tell or to judge what the cost of the land would be. They had traded with a few parties and on that basis they made the estimate for acquisition of the total amount of land. But it turned out that they had to condemn thousands and thousands of acres of this land and the estimates went much higher. For that reason the Army engineers could not make an accurate estimate, it was impossible, and that is the reason I say that in many instances they are justified in requesting more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Any time the Army engineers approve a project, if that is the system under which they operate, then this Congress in effect gives them a blank check. If the estimates are wrong, if they are negligent, then under those circumstances, once a project is started, from then on they can come to the House and expect the House to pull them out of the hole that they themselves have dug because of their own ignorance.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no evidence and the gentleman from Connecticut has not presented evidence to show that the Army engineers have failed to exercise ordinary care in connection with the estimates in these cases. They certainly were not negligent by reason of

their varying total estimates on this particular project.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When the gentleman talks about evidence, the case he cites and the cases cited by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] indicating the terrific increase in the actual expenditures and the estimates would certainly indicate gross negligence on the part of the Army engineers.

Mr. PERKINS. I disagree with the gentleman from Connecticut by reason of the fact these estimates were first made in previous years and construction costs have gone up by more than 100 percent in many instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to an error in the Appropriations Committee report with reference to certain Arkansas River projects. I do not understand how the inaccuracy got into the report, but it is too important to the people who live in the valley of the Arkansas River to go unchallenged.

The following statement appears at page 249 of the report:

Furthermore, the committee wishes it understood that in appropriating this sum (\$500,000 for work below Little Rock) it is not committing itself to the amount of \$765,460,000 estimated by the Corps of Engineers as the total Federal cost for the comprehensive plan on the Arkansas River and tributaries. There is no question in the mind of the committee but that no funds would have been recommended last year for the three projects had it been realized that they merely represented segments of an over-all plan of this magnitude.

Now, the record is clear to the effect that items referred to for the three projects were included in the conference report on the civil functions bill only after the Corps of Engineers representatives stated, in support of requests for these improvements, that the projects were segments of the authorized comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River. This is set forth at pages 565 and 1470 of the Senate hearings on the civil-functions bill for 1950.

The elimination of a budget request for other bank stabilization projects on the ground that the stabilization work was to be completed in the current year, is answered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in his address to the House on April 5, in the general debate on the pending bill, as follows:

The report of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions criticizes the Chief of Engineers for including a project on the Arkansas River on the ground that bank stabilization would be completed for the current year and that the committee of conference so provided. My understanding was that there was nothing in the conference report to notify the engineers that the previous appropriation had been made with that provision.

In the Senate hearings upon the 1950 civil-functions appropriations, Senator McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, asked the representative of the Corps of Engineers if

the sums in question for the Arkansas River were applicable to the comprehensive plan, and the reply was in the affirmative.

Three items are involved, as follows: Bank stabilization, Little Rock to the mouth of the river; bank stabilization below Dardanelle; and the Morrilton cutoff. The Dardanelle and Morrilton items were eliminated altogether and the request in the amount of \$700,000 was reduced to \$500,000, with the notation previously quoted. It is difficult to see any justification for the committee's deletion of the Dardanelle and Morrilton items on the basis that their inclusion previously was due to misinformation, particularly since the bank stabilization below Little Rock has exactly the same status as the other items in relationship to the comprehensive river program.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee's reference to the Arkansas River comprehensive plan, particularly the allusion to estimated total costs, is highly inappropriate and a reflection upon the work of other committees of the House. The Arkansas River plan as a whole was approved by the Seventy-ninth Congress, Public Law 525, and while that law contained a limitation of \$55,000,000, a bill approved by both Houses of the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 5472, raises the authorization to \$70,000,000. The conference report on this bill was filed on April 28, 1950, and an additional sum of \$10,000,000 is recommended by the conference committee, thus providing a total for the comprehensive plan of \$135,000,000. The Public Works Committee wisely limited the authorization to less than the contemplated total, thus reserving for the Legislative Committee the opportunity of having a periodic check on the progress of this highly important improvement.

The Arkansas River is the last of the Nation's great rivers to receive congressional approval for a comprehensive plan of improvement. It serves a great area in the Southwest, and is the most important stream between the Missouri River and the Gulf. For 118 years there has been Federal activity along this stream, but not until the action of the Seventy-ninth Congress was a legislative mandate for multiple-purpose improvements secured. The Congress has been generous with the people of our section, but it is fair to say that the generosity was not always accompanied by foresight. This was the substance of General Pick's statement in hearings before the Public Works Committee last year, when, in reply to Chairman WHITTINGTON's question regarding the comprehensive plan, he stated that the time had come for tying the improvements together for the purpose of giving maximum service to the area at the lowest possible cost.

Mr. Chairman, I was born within 2 miles of the Arkansas River, and all of my life, except the time I have spent in Washington, I have lived within 3 miles of that great stream.

I remember the days before it became a serious national obligation to build levees and to stabilize banks when local

farmers were bankrupted by the excessive cost of constructing levees without help from the Government. It is now a national problem, no longer a local problem. The waters that descend upon us in flood proportions are not the waters that fall upon our State, but upon other States to the west and to the north of us. And if our Nation does not view sympathetically the plight of the farmers who own lands that are destroyed by these waters, and the people dependent upon them, then, of course, there is no hope for relief for us.

Even since I came to Congress in 1943, a single flood destroyed one-tenth of all the cultivable land in the valley between Fort Smith and Little Rock. Twenty-three lives were lost in that flood. The Members will recall the emergency appropriation we made to meet the conditions of distress that grew out of it.

In spite of the tremendous natural resources of the region, the counties between Little Rock and Fort Smith, in the very heart of the Arkansas Valley, suffered losses in population between 1910 and 1940. The development of our land and water resources, including the production of hydroelectric power, offers the only hope of strengthening our economy and adding to the national wealth.

Two great national forests are in this area. One, the Ozark National Forest, is north of the river, and to the south is the Ouachita National Forest. There are vast reserves of timber offering opportunities for wood-product industries that would enter into the calculations. Of course, there are oil and coal in abundance. There is bauxite and almost every kind of material that justifies planning for navigation.

General Feringa once said that the Arkansas River is the most treacherous and the most unpredictable large stream in the United States. All the way from Colorado to the Mississippi River, it winds through an area that has vast potentialities. The people of four States look hopefully to the Congress to proceed with this program in accordance with previous actions of the Congress.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I am glad to join with my colleague in his insistence on this program being completed. Congress authorized the whole comprehensive plan, in 1946, but I think unwisely put a peg in at \$55,000,000 which precluded the engineers from starting the project. I think after a project has been authorized, that it should go to the Committee on Appropriations and not have to continue to go to these other committees seeking increased authorizations. I want to say at this time that the people in the Arkansas Valley owe a great debt of gratitude to my colleague, the gentleman who has the floor. As a member of the authorization committee of this House, I know he has continually been insistent that Arkansas be cared for. I hope he is successful in securing an appropriation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend. I am glad to have

his comment with reference to the ceilings on the authorization. I would be inclined to defer to his judgment. It seems to me, however, that there is some value in a periodic check-up by the legislative committee. For that reason I made the statement.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I endorse and give emphasis to every word the gentleman has said about the Arkansas River. It is one of the great major streams of this Nation. It has been neglected as no other major stream has.

While I am a member of the committee that has presented this bill, may I say that as a member I do not subscribe to the wording of the report of this committee.

In this connection, may I say that many of the Corps of Army Engineers are graduates of that great academy at West Point, skilled in engineering and other military tactics as they must be. In peacetime they manage our river-and-harbor, flood-control, and other civil works. They have done the world's outstanding engineering job. I challenge any corps anywhere to equal it, much less exceed it.

In time of war, the training they get here, first at West Point, then in actual experience, equips them as members of the armed services to go out in no man's land between our troops and the enemy troops to supply bridges and other engineering works in order to conserve human life.

I am shocked that anybody would have the nerve and audacity to get up here and criticize the Corps of Army Engineers for making estimates 10 or 12 or 14 years ago, or even a year ago, that are lower now than the prices are.

May I say in conclusion that I endorse everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. I endorse every statement that has been made by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], who now has the floor, and by my colleagues from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. NORRELL]. I could add additional words about the tremendous need for the improvement of the Arkansas River Valley, a portion of which is also within my district, but because time is limited I merely wish to say that I endorse the words that have been said, and wish to add any assistance I may to bringing about the completion of this comprehensive program.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, with other Members of the Congress I fully appreciate the most difficult task of the Committee on Appropriations in bringing to the House this general appropriation bill for the several departments and agencies of the Government for the fiscal year 1951.

In this history-making, record-breaking omnibus appropriation bill of approximately \$29,000,000,000 for these several agencies of the Government we are forcefully reminded how difficult it is in providing the fiscal affairs of this country. The security of our Nation, our own national defense, and the services to our people are all revealed in one compact presentation.

Whether this is the best way to consider appropriations for these services and our national security remains yet to be seen. Whether or not this approach will lend itself toward balancing the budget, that is, living within our revenues, also remains to be seen. I am fully aware, however, of the good intentions and splendid efforts of this great committee in endeavoring to assume its tremendous responsibility which it has toward the people of our country. I appreciate the efforts they have made and join with other Members of this House in commendation for their hard and faithful work throughout this session as they have endeavored to present a record justifying or not requests and demands upon the Treasury of the United States.

Throughout the debate and consideration of these various chapters I have not undertaken thus far to enter into the debate, but I feel, Mr. Chairman, that in the consideration of this chapter on civil functions that reference again should be made to some of the points of consideration and the result of the work of the committee as it is presented to the House.

I do not wish my remarks to be in the nature of criticism of the subcommittee headed by our good colleague, Judge KERR. In fact, this subcommittee, as the other subcommittee, have labored hard and endeavored to do the very best they could in providing for rivers and harbors and flood control for the next fiscal year.

I have appeared before the committee and appreciated very much the courtesy extended to me and deep concern for the problems present and the careful consideration given to what I endeavored to say.

Frankly, I think the items reported for rivers and harbors and flood control have not only been reduced to an almost irreducible minimum for the best interest of our future, but have in fact been reduced entirely too much. I would not feel this way if in my opinion reductions in the other agencies and departments on the same percentage basis had been made.

Perhaps it might be much better to reduce the appropriations of the other agencies to the same extent in an effort to balance our budget and bring our expenditures in line with the revenue, but as a practical situation it has not been done. As I understand and from reading the report and making comparisons, civil-functions appropriations have been reduced by something like 25 percent from that requested by the Budget. No other item has, as I view the report, been so reduced.

I think it is well recognized that there is no better way of strengthening the economy of this country and making us

stronger than by developing these resources. Economically speaking, there is a return of the dollar spent for these purposes in many, many ways.

If this bill is going to stand as reported, that is, other agencies are not going to be reduced accordingly, then I feel, Mr. Chairman, these items should be restored.

I had hoped the committee could be more successful in bringing about a general reduction, because we cannot afford to continue indefinitely deficit spending without ultimately destroying our economy.

If an effort is made to bring this appropriation, providing the funds for these other agencies, in line with the reduction made for civil functions, I will support such a move.

Furthermore, there are recommendations in the report which I consider to be criticisms of the Corps of Engineers, some of which I do not feel are valid criticisms, but realize at the same time that the committee was acting in accordance with what it believed to be the facts.

Something has already been said by others in connection with the report, and at the risk of being repetitious, I should like to refer to some of these criticisms in an effort merely to keep the record straight. In fact some of these things could well be said over and over in order to emphasize what the record shows and what the Corps of Engineers has endeavored to do in carrying out its responsibility, as directed by the Congress, in behalf of the Nation.

EXPENDITURES BY LOCAL MUNICIPALITIES

In the first place, the committee recommends that the Corps of Engineers discourage expenditures by local communities on the basis of surveys and recommendations made by the Corps of Engineers and states that "it has come to the attention of the committee that, in some instances, local funds have been uneconomically employed because anticipated Federal appropriations were subsequently not made."

There have undoubtedly been cases where local communities have undertaken work which would conform with Federal improvements anticipated in the future. As a general rule this merely represents logical planning on the part of local communities; and merely reflects the close liaison which the Corps of Engineers as a Federal construction agency maintains with affected local agencies. The Corps of Engineers, however, does not encourage local expenditures in anticipation of appropriations of Federal funds.

HOUSING OF CONTRACTORS' EMPLOYEES

In its report, the Appropriations Committee calls attention to what it terms as the "practice of providing housing for contractors' employees" which is followed by the Corps of Engineers; and states that savings could be effected by contractors housing their own employees even if the cost of such housing was included in contractors' bids.

The general practices of the Corps of Engineers is that contractors will provide for housing of their own employees;

and instructions of the Chief of Engineers to that effect have been in force since September 1947. There are some isolated cases where it may be more economical to the Government to provide housing, but such procedure is approved by the Chief of Engineers only as specific exceptions. When the Chief of Engineers approves housing of contractors' employees it is because of isolated location of projects and the necessity for attracting large numbers of competent contractors. Also in some cases provision of housing of contractors' employees is necessary and more economical to permit successive use of the housing on subsequent construction contracts by other contractors. At present there are less than 10 projects out of more than 200 projects under construction where the Government is providing housing for any sizable number of contractors' employees.

INCREASE IN COSTS OF THE CIVIL-WORKS PROGRAM

The committee presents an analysis of cost estimates furnished by the Corps of Engineers and draws the conclusions and makes the serious charges that—

(a) The Chief of Engineers has committed the Government and is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of amounts contemplated by the Congress either at the time of the original authorization of the projects or at the time funds were appropriated for initiation of construction; and

(b) Continued modifications in design and structure made by the Corps of Engineers on projects, once construction has been initiated, are expensive to say the least and border on profligacy.

These charges made against a Federal agency which has heretofore enjoyed the confidence of Congress and the public should be examined carefully.

INCREASES OVER ORIGINAL ESTIMATES

In order to show that the Chief of Engineers has committed the Federal Government to expenditures in excess of those contemplated by Congress when projects were authorized, the committee report makes the following comparison of total costs of civil-works projects in the approved budget estimates for fiscal year 1951:

Total of original estimated costs when authorized by Congress	\$4,364,000,000
Total present (1949) estimated cost	\$7,034,000,000
Increase	\$2,270,000,000
Percentage of increase in cost	52

The committee does not point out, although it is clearly published in the hearings, that the original estimated costs of the projects in question were made over a period of years to present requests for appropriations. Construction costs have risen greatly since original estimates were made.

For example, about 80 percent of the current civil-works program was authorized by Congress during the past 25 years. In this period, Engineering News Record construction-cost index, which is representative of the type of work included

in the civil-works program, has risen by 130 percent. In other words, construction costs have more than doubled in this period, although there have been intermediate fluctuations in prices such as the temporary downward trend during the depression years. Furthermore, most of the projects in the 1951 budget estimates were originally estimated and authorized prior to World War II. The ENR construction index has risen from the pre-World War level of 242 in 1940 to 477 in 1949, an increase of 97 percent.

It seems obvious, therefore, that an over-all increase of 52 percent of present costs above original estimates, is well within the general rise in construction costs applicable to these projects. It indicates that the estimates presented by the Chief of Engineers as a basis for authorizations by Congress were carefully and conservatively prepared, and have afforded a sound and reliable basis for authorization of civil-works projects.

INCREASES OVER ESTIMATES WHEN FUNDS WERE APPROPRIATED

In order to show that estimated costs of projects have increased excessively over costs presented by the Corps of Engineers when funds were appropriated for initiation of construction, the Committee report presents the following figures on total estimated costs for projects in 1951 budget estimates:

Estimate for fiscal year 1949	\$6,073,765,000
Estimate for fiscal year 1951	\$7,034,408,000
Increase in dollars	\$960,643,000
Percentage increase	16

The figures presented by the Appropriations Committee include one large project, that for the Arkansas River, in such a way as to magnify the true difference between 1949 and 1951 estimates for the program as a whole. If this one project is removed from the list to make the estimates comparable, the comparison would show an actual over-all cost increase of only 10 percent between estimates presented by the Corps of Engineers in support of fiscal year 1949 appropriations and those presented in support of the 1951 appropriations now being considered.

In this connection it should be noted that the cost estimates for fiscal year 1949 presented by the Chief of Engineers were based on September 1947 price levels, while estimates presented in support of estimates for the fiscal year 1951 are based on July 1949 price levels. The Engineering News Record construction-cost index has increased from 426.4 in September 1947 to 477.4 in July 1949, showing a general rise in construction costs applicable to civil-works projects of about 12 percent. Thus, the over-all increase of 10 percent in cost estimates presented by the Chief of Engineers is actually less than might have been expected due to the general rise in construction costs.

In presenting its figures and in severely criticizing the increases in estimated costs, the committee refers to the Department of Commerce composite construction-cost index increase of 14 percent between November 1947 and November 1949. The composite index used by the committee covers all types of construction and is not as applicable to the

civil-works program as is the Engineering News Record index referred to by the Chief of Engineers in hearings before the Appropriations Committee. However, use by the committee of a 14-percent increase appears to confirm the validity of estimates presented by the Corps of Engineers rather than detract from them.

It appears therefore that the Appropriations Committee has presented figures proving that in general the costs of civil-works projects have increased less than the general Nation-wide rise in construction costs. It is difficult to see how the difference between 1945 and 1951 estimates supports the "conclusion that the Chief of Engineers is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of amounts contemplated by Congress at the time funds were appropriated for initiation of construction."

THE MAJOR INCREASES IN COST OF PROJECTS ARE DUE TO ENGINEERING AND STRUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS MADE BY THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

The committee states that—

The major portion of the increases is due to engineering and structural modifications permitted under authorizing legislation to be made by the Chief of Engineers.

In support of this point the committee makes an analysis of information on cost increases between 1947 and 1949 on 63 selected projects, which was furnished the Corps of Engineers. As a result of this analysis the committee arrives at the following figures:

(a) Engineering and construction modifications authorized by the Chief of Engineers seem to amount to 58 percent or a major portion of the increased total Federal costs; and

(b) For some reason, not quite clear to the committee, over 33 percent of the increase is placed on higher construction costs; and that no construction-cost index known to the committee substantiates the 33-percent figure.

These figures used by the committee were based on information specifically requested from the Corps of Engineers, and are mathematically correct, but the analysis and conclusions drawn by the committee do not reflect the facts in the case.

The totals of the cost figures furnished the committee at its request by the Corps of Engineers are as follows for the specified 63 projects:

Fiscal year 1949 estimates (1947 price level).....	\$2,000,225,000
Fiscal year 1951 estimates (1949 price level).....	\$2,503,341,000
Increase in dollars.....	\$503,116,000
Percentage of increase.....	25

The break-down of the reasons for the increase in cost requested by the committee and used by it was as follows:

	Amount	Percent
(1) Rise in construction costs.....	\$171,306,000	34
(2) Engineering and construction modifications.....	292,502,000	58
(3) Additional authorizations.....	39,308,000	8
Total.....	\$503,116,000	100

In the first place it should be stated that an analysis of the increase in cost of

these estimates should be a comparison of the \$503,116,000 increase with the estimated cost of work remaining to be done in 1947, when the 1949 estimate was made, as the rise is, of course, not applicable to work already completed. This estimated cost of remaining work was \$1,475,000,000, and the increase to 1951 estimate was therefore about 34 percent. This increase is naturally higher than the normal rise of 12 percent in cost index between 1947 and 1949 estimates because the 63 projects were selected by the committee to show cases where there had been an abnormal increase. An even greater number of projects could have been selected from the budget estimates which would either show no increase in estimated cost or increases well within the rise in the cost index.

A more detailed break-down of the increase in cost between 1949 and 1951 estimates for the 63 selected projects shows that the engineering-and-construction-modification category specified by the committee includes large amounts which should not be included in this category. The correct break-down of this increase in cost, together with percentages of the increase, is as follows:

	Amount	Percent
(1) Rise in construction costs.....	\$171,306,000	34
(2) Enlargements and extensions of projects authorized by specific and general legislation.....	125,784,000	25
(3) Changes in conditions and physical difficulties which could not have been foreseen when estimates were made.....	41,834,000	8
(4) Increases in costs of lands, rights-of-way, and relocations.....	51,117,000	11
(5) Engineering and construction modifications.....	113,075,000	22
Total.....	\$503,116,000	100

It is thus apparent that only 22 percent of the cost increase for the 63 projects may be charged accurately to engineering and construction modifications in the sense in which this term is used by the committee in its report. And the \$113,075,000 increase resulting from these changes is only 7.7 percent of the estimate of cost of work remaining to be done when the 1949 estimates were made. The 58 percent figure used by the committee without further analysis is very misleading as to the magnitude of these changes.

The second point made by the committee in its analysis of the estimated costs of the 63 projects is that over 33 percent of the increase in costs is placed on higher construction costs and that no construction-cost index known to the committee substantiates the 33-percent figure.

It is true, as indicated by the break-down of the cost increase given previously, that the rise in construction costs accounts for about 34 percent of the total cost increase—or for an increase amounting to \$171,306,000. The committee compares this figure—using 33 percent—with the 14-percent rise in the Department of Commerce composite construction-cost index, apparently to show that costs under the Corps of Engineers have increased at a rate far be-

yond that warranted by the general rise of construction costs. The figure of 33 percent used by the committee however merely shows the part of a total greater increase attributable to a rise in the cost index; but is not comparable with any index. Actually the \$171,306,000 increase is only 11.6 percent of the \$1,745,000,000 estimate of work remaining to be done when 1949 estimates were prepared; and is less than the 12-percent rise in the Engineering News Record index between 1947 and 1949 and less than the 14-percent rise in the Commerce Department index used by the committee.

AVAILABILITY OF COST AND ENGINEERING DATA

The committee states that it "has reason to believe that very little cost and engineering data with respect to individual projects is on file with the Chief of Engineers, most records being maintained at offices of the various district engineers."

The Chief of Engineers and his representatives have appeared before the Bureau of the Budget, including its engineering staff, with detailed cost and engineering data on every project being considered for 1951 appropriations; and budget estimates were approved on the basis of that data. This same data was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Furthermore at the request of a member of the Appropriations Committee, made through the Bureau of the Budget, the Office, Chief of Engineers, prepared and made available original estimated costs, present estimated costs and other cost data on almost 2,000 separate projects comprising the entire authorized civil-works program.

It is quite true that the basic engineering data and cost computations on which the Chief of Engineers bases his cost estimates is prepared and kept in district offices. It would be entirely unreasonable to keep such detailed data in the Office, Chief of Engineers, as this would require a greatly increased staff in that office, duplication of effort, and much greater overhead costs.

APPROVAL OF COSTS

The committee concludes that as a result of lack of cost and engineering data in the Office, Chief of Engineers, "these excessive obligations of Federal funds are being incurred by the district engineers and are, it would seem, approved by the Chief of Engineers as a matter of form."

One of the primary and most important functions performed by the Office, Chief of Engineers, is review of plans, specifications, and estimates presented by district engineers. Expensive changes in projects and increases in cost are never approved as a "matter of form" but only after careful analysis and through engineering and economic presentations by district engineers. This is the reason why in spite of necessary changes in some instances, and authorized modifications in the scope of some projects, the over-all increases in costs of the civil-works program under the Corps of Engineers have been less than the normal increases in construction costs throughout the country.

The committee, in a spirit of helpfulness, I am sure, says in the report the

Chief of Engineers has committed the Government and is continuing to commit the Government to the expenditure of funds far in excess of the amount contemplated by the Congress, either at the time of the original authorization of the contract or at the time the funds were appropriated for initiating construction, continued modification, and so forth. I do not agree with the committee and respectfully submit the record does not sustain such contention. Now it is well known what the facts are. For 25 years these authorizations were made; during the time when cotton was selling at 10 cents or less; when wheat was selling at 35 cents; when wages were at such tremendously low figures, and now you indicate you would expect the engineers to use cheap labor as has been discussed so much on the floor of this House, and to use cheap materials that you had 15 or 20 years ago, to use the same low economy which was at that time so much below what it is now.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose you get the price of cotton up to 40 or 50 cents a pound and the price of wheat up to \$1.50 or \$2 a bushel, and the price of oats up to a dollar a bushel, you go into the red \$7,000,000,000 a year, and you go so far and so long that you are going to wreck the economy of the country. What makes the difference? As long as you are trying to wreck everything, there ought to be a time when you ought to economize in the operation of Government and get down to solid facts and stop doing a lot of things you are doing now.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not yield any further.

The gentleman is not a member of the Appropriations Committee—

Mr. RICH. If I were I would be cutting this down to the core.

Mr. HARRIS. The engineers are not responsible for high cost. They have nothing to do with high prices, high wages, or high index in our economy. They only construct these projects as directed by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has again expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. I had a lot of things I would like to say; I think I have the facts, and I wish I had the time to present those facts. I think it is a sad situation that we come here with a 29-billion-dollar appropriation bill, with almost 700 million dollars involved here, and limit this debate to 2 hours, when there are important matters to be discussed like this. I am not saying it to my good friends, the members of this committee, in any spirit of criticism, but because I think the record should be clear.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say to the gentleman that the things he complains about, the advances in costs, and

so on, were all taken into consideration in arriving at these figures, and these cuts according to the cost estimates of the Department of Engineers.

Mr. HARRIS. I recognize that the committee has made every possible attempt to get at the facts and to find out just what the situation is, but the indication here is that the engineers, because costs have gone up, are responsible, though many of these projects were authorized over a period of 20 to 25 years ago. They are not the ones who increased these costs.

Mr. RABAUT. There were cost increases allowed to them a year ago. Then the index, in relation to costs, was taken into consideration in arriving at the action taken this year by the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I am sure the Engineering News Record cost index was taken into consideration, too.

The other point I wish to make is, recognizing the tremendous difficulty that this committee has had, and appreciating the fact that you have done the best you can, I still think, if we are going to economize, let us economize all along the way, and provide a budget as it should be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], has largely made my speech for me this afternoon. I agree with his appraisal of the variation in the estimated over-all costs by the Corps of Engineers for the projects under consideration in this bill.

To have a 52-percent increase in the present over-all estimates of costs for these projects as compared with initial estimates; to have an increase of a billion dollars or more in the estimates for these projects in the past 2 years, just seems to me entirely out of line with the standards which we have a right to expect from the Corps of Engineers.

As the report points out, an analysis of the increase in respect to 63 major projects shows that 33 percent of the increase is due to alleged higher construction costs, which cannot be justified in the light of any price index that the committee has been able to find. It shows also that 58 percent of the increase appears to be attributable to engineering and construction changes which have been authorized by the Chief of Engineers.

The fact is, as the report states, that the Chief of Engineers has been committing this Government to the expenditure of sums far in excess of the amounts contemplated at the time that individual projects were authorized or at the time the initial work on those projects was covered by appropriation; and it is entirely conceivable that the projects might not have been authorized or might not have been started had the later estimates been presented.

It is very difficult indeed to understand the variation in the estimates which have been presented to the Congress. It

indicates that those estimates in the first instance were of very little value or were based on entirely inadequate data.

Mr. Chairman, the total in this bill, as has been pointed out, is about \$632,000,000; that is about \$31,000,000 less than was made available in the fiscal year 1950.

There are several smaller items which call for no particular discussion.

For "cemetery expense, Department of the Army, \$5,500,000" is provided a million dollars or so less than the budget estimate and about a million dollars more than was available for fiscal 1950.

I may point out in passing, as indicating the costs we are called upon to pay by the agencies of the Government, that among the items for expenditure requested under this heading, are flagpoles at a cost of over \$4,600 per pole. Think of it.

For the Alaska communications service \$3,000,000 is provided, which is about \$100,000 less than the Budget Bureau recommended and is the same amount that was allowed for the current fiscal year.

The committee recommends the appropriation of a million dollars for the more urgent construction work for necessary facilities.

I may point out however as indicating further the prices that we are called upon to pay nowadays, that the request included funds for 28 family houses for NCO's at an estimated cost from \$28,000 to \$42,000 per family unit, plus \$5,000 for site development.

Those houses would be of ordinary frame construction, with asbestos shingles, concrete basement, and according to the testimony of one member of the committee who has had some experience in this field, should be built in this country for about \$4,000.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman mentioned Alaskan construction. I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Armed Services which handled the authorization for construction and handled the communications bill. At the time the estimates were made for construction up there we thought perhaps the engineers were high. For instance, they came in with figures showing a house would cost \$35,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Per family unit?

Mr. BROOKS. We refused the authorization. We had our own investigators go out and they got people from Alaska and made an independent check. They found the engineers were within the right figure on that. As a result, we took the ceiling off the cost of construction in Alaska in that particular bill because the costs were so high there was no alternative if we wanted the work done and if we wanted to defend this country.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that \$47,000 per family unit exceeds any costs for similar construction, I ever heard of.

Mr. BROOKS. It sounds terrific and I will tell the gentleman that we did not think the figures were fair. So we sent out our own investigators, we made our own independent investigation with contractors and people who knew the situation up in Alaska and they said it could not be done for any less.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Than what figure?

Mr. BROOKS. As I recall the figure for Alaska construction in the bill that we handled, it was \$35,000 per unit.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This estimate is as high as \$47,000 per unit if everything is included.

Mr. BROOKS. That is in line with the terrific cost of construction in Okinawa and in Alaska, where the costs are terrifically out of line with any other place in the whole world, I believe.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is very difficult for people who have had any sort of business experience to try to reconcile themselves to the fact that anybody going to Alaska to live is going to need \$40,000 or \$50,000 to build an ordinary little house.

These figures might be justified in a special instance. They might be justified for some Government agencies. But if we are going to spend \$40,000 or \$50,000 to house civilians who are going to Alaska, and we are talking about statehood for Alaska, we are getting into an awfully high-priced proposition.

Now, we had another experience here lately, if the gentleman will bear with me for a minute, of a project that was taken down in Alaska and moved to Seattle, then purchased by another Government agency and taken back to Alaska. That is some of the cooperation which exists between Government agencies. It is no criticism of the gentleman, who is really telling the same things that were told us about the cost of building in Alaska. The prices are simply out of this world. Something has to be done if we are going to have in Alaska a respectable figure for building.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to the gentleman that if we are going to have protection and national defense in Alaska, we have to pay the bill. When the materials are brought from the United States and labor is brought from the United States and everything else is at a terrifically high cost, we will have to pay the bill. It does seem to me to be out of the world, I agree with the gentleman. But our committee made an investigation of this thing and we were convinced that the engineers were in line.

Mr. RABAUT. With the investigations that have been made of people who are interested in housing and building in Alaska, a terrible error was made when we permitted a whole project to be torn down, taken out of Alaska and sent to Seattle, then bought by another Government agency and taken back up to Alaska.

Mr. BROOKS. I am not defending that.

Mr. RABAUT. I know that and I am not laying it at the gentleman's door-

step. I do not make that inference. But I am talking about the agencies of Government and how indifferent they are to the things that cost the taxpayers money, things which this committee is taking special cognizance of.

Mr. BROOKS. Perhaps they should be more diligent in checking on it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think it is necessary to mention the item for the United States Soldiers' Home of \$2,395,000; or for the Panama Canal, of \$21,825,000; or for the Panama Railroad Company, of \$820,000, which reflect either the budget estimate or slight reductions.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Since we are talking about this Alaska building situation, I think I can throw a little light on the matter which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] just talked about.

In 1946 a number of us members of the Committee on the Interior visited Alaska, and we made quite an investigation of many things that were going on up there.

The buildings which the gentleman just mentioned were the Navy installations at Excursion Inlet that were torn down and shipped to Seattle. It was frame construction. There was all kinds of fine lumber in those buildings. I saw them as did the other members of the committee. There were doors, there was flooring, there were windows, there was everything with which to build houses.

Across the bay about 15 miles was the town of Hoonah, an Indian village, and every one of those homes in that village had burned down. There were 86 homes. They were built out over the water, most of them, and they had stored gasoline under these houses, and this gasoline caught fire and the whole town went up in smoke.

They shipped this lumber from the buildings at Excursion Inlet to Seattle. Now, I know they did not take the same lumber and send it back, because we saw the homes go up. They were building homes for those Indians at a cost of \$8,600, and they were putting the finest lumber that I ever saw in those homes, with fine oak floors and fine doors and fine windows and asphalt roofs and everything that goes to make a very fine home.

Well, the Indians were not appreciating that kind of a home very much, because the fellow in charge said that it would not be long until they would have the doors off and they would have a bearskin hanging up for the doors, and the panes in the windows would be out and they would put something over the windows. So it was not an encouraging picture, when they could have taken that lumber from Excursion Inlet and taken it right across the bay and built those homes for possibly \$1,000 apiece, and the Indians would have been tickled to death with that kind of lumber and with a more simple home. These homes were modern in every respect, and everything was charged to Uncle Sam. Now, that was a despicable thing to do.

We have things going on that are worse even than that.

The Army and the Navy and every department of Government, instead of using standard doors, standard windows, standard millwork when they build buildings, have special designs, specially designed doors, specially designed entrances and specially designed windows that cost from five to ten to fifty times more than the standard stock does, and we are paying the bill, and that is why it runs up so terribly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I should like the RECORD to show that this is not chargeable to the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. JENSEN. No, indeed. I was not criticizing the Army engineers.

Mr. NORRELL. If the gentleman will indulge us just a moment, I have seen the houses being built in Okinawa and Guam. I have not seen them in Alaska. However, on Okinawa and Guam they have to build the houses of concrete and steel, mostly shipped from the United States. I have been in those houses, and I would not live in one myself, although I see they cost \$47,500.

Either we have to pay that price or we do not have to build the house, but let us not charge that to the Army engineers. If we do not want to build it, let us not build it. I know the gentleman well enough to know that he is fair and square and does not mean to be unfair.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is entirely correct when he says that this is not an Army engineer item. I cited it merely as evidence of the costs we are called upon to meet by the agencies of Government nowadays.

I may say, however, that the record indicates in this instance that the houses under consideration would not be houses such as the gentleman has described. They would be of frame construction, with asbestos shingles, and a concrete basement.

Mr. NORRELL. I want the RECORD to show I have implicit confidence in the gentleman from Massachusetts. I know he is fair in all things.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time. I do want to make one further observation, however.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has indicated that in his opinion this chapter of the bill has been dealt with more or less as the whipping boy, if I understood him correctly.

May I point out that the over-all request of the Corps of Army Engineers, which, of course, is the largest request in this chapter of the bill, despite the over-all fiscal situation by which we are confronted at this time, amounted to something like 25 percent in excess of the funds which were made available in respect to the current fiscal year.

The effect of the committee's recommendation is merely to take that 25 per-

cent out of the picture and to bring the over-all appropriation down just a little bit below what it has been for the current fiscal year.

That reduction, as pointed out in the report, has been based not only on an item-by-item consideration but on certain over-all considerations. These considerations include the desirability of spreading construction activity over a period of time, with a view to unemployment in the future; the desirability of concentrating on fewer existing projects with a view to expediting their completion; and above all, the fact that delay in respect to the 1950 appropriation bill lost one construction season in many instances, and resulted in the very large unobligated balances that have already been referred to. These unobligated balances amounted to something like \$220,000,000 as of December 31 last.

I think the subcommittee has done a good job in view of the circumstances by which it has been confronted.

I shall reserve any further discussion, Mr. Chairman, until later when individual projects may be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, certain questions have been raised during the course of this debate which have brought out a good many facts which are very interesting. I am not going to repeat what has been said but I am just going to call attention to one or two things. The over-all cut in this bill was not more than it ought to be. There are some projects, the major projects which have not been cut as much in proportion as were the others. Frankly, I have always felt these projects could take a little more of a cut, and if the opportunity presents itself where that can be done I hope I may be able to offer amendments which will save a dollar or two. We were confronted with quite a proposition. There are projects involving present estimates of cost on rivers and harbors which are under construction in which the over-all estimated cost is \$2,700,000,000 for rivers and harbors. There are projects representing more than that in estimated cost at the present time for flood control. I would figure the projects under construction would cost six and one-half to seven billion dollars to complete. Frankly, I do not know where we would get the money if we should attempt to appropriate it. Our people are taxed beyond all endurance. I am one of those real peculiar fellows who votes to cut these foreign-aid projects down to the point where the people can afford to meet the situation and I reserve the right to vote for only the amount which these people can justify and which they can legitimately and honestly use. I have never believed in voting money for any agency, foreign or domestic, just because they ask for the money. I believe we have to cut our cloth down to what we can afford to pay. I do not believe we should embark upon flood-control projects or rivers and harbors projects where we do not have the money to pay for them. My efforts at economy are no more active on one line than another,

They will always be just that same proportion all the way through, as long as I happen to be here.

Just to illustrate the kind of job the engineers have come to do, I think I will call attention again to the figures that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] said the engineers used on the cost of a flagpole, something like \$1,800 for engineering on a \$6,200 flagpole. Six thousand two hundred dollars is almost enough to pay for the flagpole alone, but that is within my comprehension. I can realize how outlandish the engineers' estimates are when they ask for \$1,800 for engineering for that kind of a job. It is just so ridiculous that it cannot mean they are screening the situation the way it should be screened.

I have been hopeful that when the Congress made those people realize that they do not intend to accept estimates based on that kind of engineering, which just an ordinary fellow who has had a little business experience where engineering has been a factor, cannot be deluded into following, that they will revise their estimates. It is a situation that we must realize. Our cuts have not been deep, considering the situation. The increase in the budget estimates for this year over last year was larger than it was anywhere else. That meant that in order to get the bill down to any size, as compared with last year's bill or what we could afford to put up with, we had to make a very substantial cut; and the committee has done that. The committee worked hard. We held hearings which continued over a month, all day long. I think the committee very generally has done a first-class job on this.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very appreciative of the gentleman's efforts to promote economy, not only during the current session but in all of his career. However, I respectfully suggest to him that, while I speak from memory I think I speak correctly, that when he said the river and harbor projects aggregated \$2,700,000,000 authorized, the figure was really \$2,070,000,000.

Mr. TABER. It is \$2,780,264,270.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I was giving my recollection.

Mr. TABER. That is found on page 191 of the hearings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate that, but my recollection of the budget is that the figure is \$2,070,000,000. If I might suggest to the gentleman, that covers projects that had been authorized through the years, some of them for 50 or 75 years, that will never be constructed.

Now, with respect to the flood-control projects, permit me to say that while there is general approval of projects, which, if all of them were constructed, might amount to several billion dollars, the fact remains that there are no authorizations for any such amount, because the authorizations for flood control cover partial accomplishment of the project. And the further fact is that for general flood control including the

lower Mississippi River, after we have considered the bill that you have reported this year, only \$640,000,000 remains authorized.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman. The thing that I have been looking at all the way through has been the estimated cost. I appreciate that these people have not a great big authorization; on the other hand, I do not know what the rule is here, but I think it is just the same as it is on a building job, that where you start a project you are allowed to go on and appropriate to continue it and finish it in a great many cases.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, and with all due deference to him, the rule as I recall has been not to go beyond the authorization for flood control.

Mr. TABER. I am glad to hear that; it will enable us to follow this thing out a little closer in time to come.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman will find that that has been the policy.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to commend the subcommittee handling this chapter of the appropriations bill on a very effective job and one which has objectively sought economy. I find, however, that there are certain discrepancies in that in other chapters of the bill similar projects have received more generous treatment. Perhaps in working our will on this bill we can equalize matters in the Committee of the Whole.

I wish to call the attention of the Committee to one matter. I notice that on many projects that will be completed by the appropriations recommended by the committee, no cuts were made in the requests of the Bureau of the Budget. This, to me, makes very good sense. The cut was divided, for the most part, among those projects that are continuing and have 3 or 4 years to go before completion. I have such a project in my district, a flood wall at Louisville, Ky. Some \$11,000,000 has been appropriated with \$14,000,000 still necessary. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$4,500,000 for fiscal 1951; the committee has cut it to \$3,500,000. I may say, however, that all continuing projects such as the one located in my district took a proportionate cut, so I have no quarrel there whatsoever. It so happens that because of the topography involved that had the \$4,500,000 been allowed, pumping stations would have been provided in the west end of the city of Louisville, which suffers the most. That would have completed for the west end of the city flood protection to the extent of the flood that we had in 1913 and 1945, two of the three most severe floods in the twentieth century. The flood of 1937, our greatest flood, it would not have helped; in other words, there is high ground in the center of the city which, if the pumping station had been put in would give us a relatively completed project for that section which suffers the most. A gigantic flood such as that of 1937 would still have inundated the entire city. These problems must be studied in the future. If a reasonable amount of protection

can be given to even a section of the city by following the recommendations of the Budget Bureau, we should give consideration to that. I am sure that the committee has done all it could in the interest of economy; and, as one who has spoken for it and voted for it I recognize that the treatment I have received is the same as all others.

I do want to point out that a partial flood wall is no protection in general. Yet, in this case if the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget is followed thousands of homes and factories and retail establishments will have a reasonable degree of flood protection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the gentleman from New York who has given me 5 minutes. I could take a half hour to talk on the subject of dredging the harbors in southeastern Massachusetts. I intend, although I hesitate to do so, to offer an amendment when we come to consider this bill under the 5-minute rule to see if I cannot get the approval of Members of the Congress to do something that is long overdue. Of course, I appreciate the sympathetic hearing that was given me by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. It was very sympathetic but I did not go there to get sympathy. I went before them to see if I could get funds to have the harbors dredged, but, lo and behold, when I get the report of the committee, there is nothing appropriated for this purpose, not a single cent. I would not complain about that at all, but I have found in sitting around here for 2 or 3 years that we are ever ready to spend millions, yes billions of dollars, for foreign countries, but when it comes to old Cape Cod, the place where this country started and where there are a great many descendants of those hearty people, that dredged out their own harbors and rivers, built ships and defended this country, the Government has helped out towns and cities along the great Mississippi, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and every other river in the United States, but they forget the Pilgrim Fathers, or apparently they did, because, to my knowledge, there has not been anything done in 15 years.

All that we are asking is that the Government pay half of the cost of these projects. We will pay the other half, in addition to paying all the other taxes that are imposed on us by the Congress of the United States.

It is significant that 3 or 4 months ago the President instructed Mr. Steelman, his economic adviser, to pick out the areas that needed help due to lack of employment. New Bedford, a city I represent, was the first one on the list. There were other towns on Cape Cod and Nantucket and the upper part of Plymouth County in the same position as New Bedford.

There is no other thing that would be of more help to us than to have these

harbors dredged out so that the fishermen can get in with their catch instead of having to wait 4 or 5 hours for high tide. They have been waiting long enough and I think they are entitled to it. I want the Congress to give it the consideration it deserves. It is only a small amount, but it means a great deal to the people I represent because the only industry we have is summer visitors and fishermen. If you take the harbors away from the fishermen they cannot get in and unload their fish, then you destroy half of our income. We are a people who are not asking anybody for anything we do not deserve. We do not have too many people trying to get something for nothing so far as the Government is concerned. We never have and we do not intend to start. All we are asking is that you help us out. I realize as well as anybody why we should practice economy, but this is economy, because it gives us the opportunity to pay our taxes against all the levies that the Federal Government puts on us. The people in Provincetown have built walls and piers and all of these other necessary works for protection, but everytime we get a severe northeaster or southeaster, the wind and the water pound these defenses to pieces so that they are ruined, and when the fishermen and the yachtsmen and everybody else coming in to Provincetown Harbor put down their anchors, they do not hold, because there is nothing to stop the terrible winds and waves from washing the boats up on the shore and onto the docks, and they are broken up. For a small amount, Mr. Chairman, a jetty would save them and it would save the fishermen. They have a difficult enough job the way it is. Only 2 or 3 weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, 18 fishermen lost their lives on the Nantucket shoals, so I think it is important to have these harbors fixed up, in order that the fishermen and yachtsmen can be protected and also prevent the terrible catastrophes that have happened in the past.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for giving me this time. I certainly appreciate it.

Mr. KERR. I have no more requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. Neither have I, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on May 3, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, FIRST REPORT—RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the Eighty-first Congress is now at midpoint. In this important election year Congress normally heads for an adjournment early in July. By now the extent to which a legislative program may be enacted becomes evident. So far in this session accomplishments have been meager in domestic affairs most important to the people. And in foreign affairs the Congress indicates it will but carry on already established programs. Pending legislation will continue the European recovery program and the mutual defense assistance program, revise the displaced persons bill and inaugurate a point 4 program.

No legislation has been finally enacted regarding Federal aid to education or health. Social security reform, including increase of benefits and coverage for old age and survivors insurance, passed the House of Representatives, but is awaiting action in the Senate and even the pending bill does not yet increase benefits to realistic levels considering costs of living or adequately amend other disadvantageous provisions. Adequate housing legislation for middle-income families failed of passage in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Neither has adequate civil-rights legislation, like the FEPC, been passed—an FEPC bill with investigatory powers only passed the House of Representatives and is pending in the Senate. The vexatious excise taxes bearing directly on the cost of living have not yet been reduced or repealed but tentative action by the House Ways and Means Committee makes for a favorable outlook. Not a single major new measure has yet become law in this session.

I have worked hard here to endeavor to realize for our people the objectives of decent housing, stable employment, reasonable security, the maintenance of international peace, and the preservation of our freedoms. Within the limits of the labors of one among 435 Representatives I have endeavored to reflect the needs, the ideas, and the aspirations of my district.

RENT CONTROL

The Federal rent-control law expires, by its terms, on June 30, 1950. In the State of New York we are passing from Federal to State rent control. Whether or not Federal rent control will be renewed continues as an urgent question for the general well-being of the country,

but no longer becomes of primary interest to the people of my district for their own dwellings.

The Federal rent-control law, though it resulted in some drastic and uncalled-for increases due to the fair-net-operating-income provision, on the whole held the rent line within reason. It was found that the amendment which I wrote into the law requiring landlords to certify to the maintenance of all services before being entitled to apply for a rent adjustment was one of the most important phases of the law to protect the rights of tenants. This same amendment is now contained in the New York State rent-control law, and I will use all my efforts to see that in that law it also continues to be the useful means for protecting tenants' rights that it has been in the Federal law.

The State rent-control law rolls back rents to the amount actually paid on March 1, 1950, or March 1, 1949, whichever is lower. Increases ordered by the Federal Housing Expediter unless agreed to by the tenant or ordered paid by the City Rent Commission are not included. No retroactive increases are permitted under the new State law. It does not contain the fair-net-operating-income provision of the Federal law. It allows increases only after December 1, 1950, for a hardship amounting to actual loss in operations only. This is the original OPA basis in effect during the war years. The New York State rent-control law gives tenants a right of hearing in regard to increases in rent. It has safeguards against evictions, and strict penalties against landlords violating its provisions.

The State law permits increases, after December 1, 1950, due to severe hardship on grounds of comparability. Its administration under a distinguished public servant like the Honorable Joseph P. McGoldrick, former comptroller of the city of New York, assures tenants against abuses of this provision.

In addition the facilities of my congressional rent clinics are being further expanded and additional staff added to the branches now operating throughout the district. The corps of lawyers working in these clinics on a voluntary basis has had considerable additional experience: They are now in a position to render outstanding service to the people of my district. The congressional rent clinics continue to function under the chairmanship of Hyman W. Sobell, Esq. A schedule is available upon application to my office showing the location of these clinics, the hours of operation and the lawyers in charge. A similar service is now being inaugurated by the New York County Republican Party throughout the county under the supervision of a committee of which I am cochairman with Oren Root of New York.

In view of the importance of rent control to the people of the country I shall work for and support Federal rent control here. Even with New York out of the Federal rent-control system there are still some 8,000,000 dwelling units under Federal control. This is a critically important front in the national

fight against inflation and must continue to be protected in the interest of all of our people.

HOUSING

I cannot report any real victory for housing in this session nearly comparable to the authorization of 810,000 new Federal low-rent public housing units and a \$1,500,000,000 slum-clearance program by the Federal Housing Act of 1949. It is true that the authority of the FHA to insure mortgages has been increased by about \$2,250,000,000, and that this will help materially private construction in industry and those who are out to buy homes of their own. But in the rental field, particularly for the family in the \$2,000 to \$4,000 per annum income bracket—which includes most unhoused veterans' families—there is still no real relief.

I fought very hard for approval this year of a Federal program to assist the construction of rental housing for families in this middle-income bracket. I sought \$3,000,000,000 in direct loans from the Federal Government to housing co-operatives for that purpose. This was finally whittled down to \$1,000,000,000 in the form of a National Bank for Housing Cooperatives which would have enabled the Federal Government to make mortgage money available to 3¼ percent for 60 years, in this way reducing rentals for the normal city apartment from \$85 per month to about \$63 per month and bringing it within reach of the middle-income family. Even this title was defeated in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Together with many other Representatives here I have not given up this fight. We may have to wait until the next Congress to win but I am confident that win we shall. These middle-income families can neither qualify for public housing nor afford private rental housing. Their problem remains almost as acute as it did just after the war in 1945. They must indeed have help. And it is up to us here to see that they get it.

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR

Grave concern exists with respect to the size of unemployment the country may have to face this summer and fall. The present unemployment recorded in the United States Employment Service Offices is 4,123,000. Fears are expressed that this will go up to 5,000,000 in a few months. That figure used to be a danger signal before the war. However, at that time we had approximately 45,000,000 Americans gainfully employed; today we have almost 60,000,000 gainfully employed. Hence unemployment of 5,000,000 should not be as alarming as it used to be. It is certainly a bleak prospect, however, for the individuals concerned, and we must give them adequate aid.

The unemployment insurance systems will help but these must be very much strengthened as the benefits differ widely between States and many give far less than the optimum 26 weeks of coverage. We must see that these systems are strengthened so that they can do their job in an emergency.

Also, we must consider other means for making our economic system more

stable. Increasingly, I believe, legislation to provide stable employment and a stable economy will come up for consideration. I have proposed such legislation myself through the establishment of a Federal Economic Commission and of goals for our economy which business and Government can act together to effectuate. I am convinced that planless acceptance of the inevitability of widespread unemployment as a chronic ailment of our economic system is undesirable and unnecessary, and I shall use my efforts to see that no such suffering is inflicted on our people because of unwillingness to take remedial measures.

We faced a crisis in the last few months in the coal strike which threatened to paralyze the whole country. We may soon face a similar problem in railroads and telephones. These situations bear out what I have been strongly advocating—that Congress should give the President power to seize mines or facilities where essential to the public health and safety, but with the right to operate them only to the minimum extent required for such health and safety. I have introduced legislation expressly for this purpose and have pointed this out as a necessary element in labor legislation. It now becomes apparent that this is an essential power of Government in the interest of all the people and I shall continue to work to see that this deficiency in our law is corrected.

FEPC

The House of Representatives finally had its opportunity to debate a Fair Employment Practice Commission bill providing for equality of job opportunity without discrimination on account of race, color, creed, or national origin. Such a law has been operating in the State of New York very successfully for a considerable time and is also in effect in nine other States, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Wisconsin, Indiana, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Oregon, and Washington. The mere problem of bringing this legislation up for debate was monumental, but by cooperative effort on the part of all of us who were fighting for this bill it was finally accomplished. Debate opened at the usual hour of noon on Wednesday, February 22, and continued until 3 a. m. the following morning. At that time, in spite of all of our efforts to the contrary, the House of Representatives by a vote substituted for the FEPC bill with enforcement powers an FEPC bill with investigatory powers only.

It is true that this was the first time in history that such a bill has passed the House at all, but the absence of the power to enforce the orders of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission was a great disappointment to those of us who fought so hard for this bill. We were then faced with the dire alternative of voting down what the House of Representatives had passed and having no FEPC bill of any kind or voting to send even this inadequate bill to the Senate. I chose the latter course as did most of the liberal Members of the House in both parties. I am convinced this was the right course; otherwise, any hope for FEPC legislation would have been killed

for this session. Now at the very least the issue is forced upon the Senate and it must consider the FEPC bill which came from the House. At the same time our ability to fight for an FEPC bill with full enforcement powers is not at all impaired.

The battle has shifted to the Senate, but my interest in it is so great that I am continuing my work here with Senators, on the public platform and over the radio to attain an FEPC bill with full enforcement powers.

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The Congress continues to overlook urgently needed legislation in this field. A national health program is almost exactly where it was before, except that a material increase in the annual sums available for hospital construction, doubling these, from \$75,000,000 to \$150,000,000, has passed the House. No action, however, has been taken on a national program for health either along the lines of the plan which I have offered, providing for Federal-State aid to co-operative plans, organized on a community and local level, or on the administration's own health plan financed by a compulsory pay-roll tax. The national responsibility for health must be accepted and work to get this done must continue unabated.

No action has been taken either on Federal aid to education. I continue unequivocally in favor of such legislation and do not consider help to school construction or health services—desirable as these are—to be a substitute. The terms of the Barden bill, which prevents States from using any of the proposed Federal aid for any services, even health services, except for public schools, is still an issue delaying the bill. The Senate has passed bills aiding school-building construction and school-health services, but the House has not acted. I have expressed myself as being opposed to restrictions imposed by the Barden bill. There should be no little argument about health services for all children, regardless of the schools they attend, and the Supreme Court has ruled that there should be equality in respect of bus service to all schools. With the overwhelmingly complex problems which our young people will face when they become adults, fundamental improvement in our educational system particularly in States which are below par in this respect is vital. I shall continue to fight for these principles to gain Federal aid to education.

In the course of this session I have offered a bill, H. R. 7336, to set up a Federal Board of Education as recommended by the Hoover Commission and also to abolish segregation and discrimination in educational institutions receiving Federal aid. Right now this applies to institutions of higher learning, which received over \$3,500,000,000 a year from the Federal Government in 1949. It is high time that this essential reform was made nationally, just as we have already made it in New York.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social-security improvements which have already passed the House are tied up in the Senate. The gains effected by

H. R. 6000 in extending old-age and survivors insurance to millions of self-employed, to employees of State and local governments and nonprofit organizations on a voluntary basis, to domestic servants, to agricultural-processing workers, and to certain other employees should pass at this session. Increasing benefits from 50 percent for the highest pension groups to 150 percent for the lowest pension groups, and increasing the minimum monthly benefits from \$10 to \$25, and the maximum monthly benefits from \$85 to \$150 is a step in the right direction, although with present living costs far from adequate.

There has been some criticism of H. R. 6000 as it could be by a referendum of those affected supersede some State and city retirement plans, but both Senators from New York are trying to strike this out in the Senate.

Social-security improvement is good legislation which the people want and I shall do all I can to see that it becomes law before this Congress ends, but we must go much further. Our population is aging, job opportunities for older people are becoming less plentiful, living costs are advancing, and it is becoming harder to pile up private resources against advancing age. A strengthened social-security system upon which retired people can really live is a must for our society.

EXCISE AND INCOME TAXES

This session has been characterized by a great drive to relieve the people of the wartime luxury taxes on items entering into the ordinary cost of living which are not luxuries at all. These include, among others, moving-picture admissions, inexpensive cosmetics, baby oil, popular-priced handbags and moderate-priced fur coats costing no more than cloth coats in the same price range. The fight to repeal the moving-picture admissions tax has especially brought out the support of the people of my district.

The President has made certain recommendations regarding reductions of excise taxes but the items he covered are far more limited than the need of the moderate-income families indicates.

I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in favor of repeal of these excise taxes and have been supporting and fighting for the consideration of measures which would effect this result. The committee has now tentatively acted in reducing excise taxes in some cases and repealing them in others. Such favorable tentative action has been taken repealing excise taxes on electric-light bulbs, purses and handbags, and baby oil and powder; and by reducing them on motion-picture admissions, communications, transportation, jewelry, and furs.

It will be said that excise-tax reduction must be coupled with means for raising additional revenue through taxes. Aside from economies in the administration of government, many of which can be effected by utilizing the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government, it is also possible to save large sums of money on programs like the farm price-support

program, which I will discuss a little later in this speech.

Consideration should be given to a graduated income tax on corporate profits instead of the present flat tax, and to closing up the tax loopholes in present laws. All of these steps should be taken first before reconsidering the personal income tax. Suggestions have also been made for charges to be made by the Federal Government for certain services now rendered free but from which the recipients get monetary benefits.

I have been seeking action on my bill exempting from Federal income taxes the pensions of Federal, State and city employees up to \$2,000 a year and also disability pensions. Recently, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7443, allowing a deduction from income subject to income tax to the extent of \$600 per year, for those with serious physical handicaps—the same allowance made for the blind. It will interest the people of my district to know that I got the idea for such a bill from a letter from one of my constituents and that the bill has received widespread notice.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

A storm of protest broke out over the drastic curtailment of mail deliveries to homes and offices announced by the Postmaster General as attributable to budget limitations on April 18, 1950; effective in New York, June 1. It subsequently became clear that the Post Office Department had not asked Congress for the necessary money but had just gone ahead with this drastic move. With much support from my district I have vigorously protested this action, both in the House of Representatives and to the Postmaster General. So much opposition has been aroused that I believe corrective action will not be long delayed.

The principal effort during this session to help postal employees has been to pass in the House of Representatives H. R. 87, the military-credits bill. This bill affords to postal employees a starting salary grade commensurate with their status after giving them credit for their war service. It appears to be an eminently fair application of the principle that no employee should be penalized for the time when he was serving his country. It is likely that this principle will be extended to benefit all Federal employees.

Salary increases and other problems had to give way to the military-credits bill in which there was the principal interest right now. Other developments under this heading will follow as the session goes on.

SMALL BUSINESS

The fight to retain the vitality and position of small business while giving all business relief from a decision of the Supreme Court raising doubt as to the lawfulness of sales at delivered prices—not just f. o. b. prices—has been going on continuously. The effort to limit the effect of remedial legislation so that it would not jeopardize small business has resulted in a considerable struggle. Those of us who are deeply concerned about the small-business position, though we have been fighting as the opposition a rear-guard action, have nevertheless had considerable influence in

bringing about changes to protect small business. We are not satisfied with it, but it is certainly better than what was presented to us to begin with, and we shall work hard to see that, if it does become law, its administration does not violate the spirit of small-business protection.

VETERANS

The House of Representatives has approved by an overwhelming vote and sent to the Senate for action the addition of 16,000 beds for veterans' hospitals, 1,000 of these in New York. These include many urgently needed psychiatric facilities.

One of the principal problems of veterans so far in this session has related to VA cuts in hospitals and medical and auxiliary staffs. I have protested these cuts and urged the Veterans' Administration to seek a deficiency appropriation to avoid them. This is now being done with resultant withdrawal of reductions in medical and hospital staffs.

Veterans who have suffered wounds in the protection of their country are entitled to the best we can offer, certainly in medical care and equipment. Many veterans are concerned about the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which would eliminate a separate veterans' hospital and medical service for veterans. I share this concern and assure the veterans of my district that I will consider not only the economies involved in such a move, but would have to be shown affirmatively that the veteran will get medical service equal to what he is getting now plus particular consideration for his care as a veteran. In other words, on this proposal the burden of proof is distinctly on those who propose a merger of Government hospital and medical facilities.

Veterans have also been concerned with VA regulations seriously curtailing their educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. Bills are pending to lift these limitations and give veterans their full opportunity for educational benefits, permitting them to take the courses and attend the schools which will do them the most good. There may be some help afforded with this in the pending appropriations bill. I have introduced legislation similar to the Taft-Teague bill for this purpose and I am working here to get it enacted and will guard against any effort to emasculate this remedial legislation by amendments.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We are all deeply concerned and exercised about exposing and routing out subversives—Communists and Fascists alike—who may be in our midst. We are also concerned about victory for the forces of freedom in the cold war. In order to effectuate both these aims, it is neither necessary nor wise to weaken or impair our constitutional guarantees and freedoms which protect the innocent individual here.

It is interesting at this point to quote the words of J. Edgar Hoover, the great director of the FBI, who said as recently as March 27, 1950:

I would not want to be a party to any action which would smear innocent individ-

uals for the rest of their lives. We cannot disregard the fundamental principles of common decency and the application of basic American rights of fair play.

This question has come forward very strongly in connection with the recent investigations of subversive activities in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It is essential that we hold the balance between the investigatory powers of the Congress which in the national interest we must protest, and the capability of destroying the reputations and the means of livelihood of innocent people. Such activities have inflicted mounting damage on the position of the United States abroad and upon the respect here at home for the justice and efficacy of our institutions.

I recognized this situation a long time ago, saw how it was of great concern to all fair-minded Americans and might particularly concern large minorities like Catholics, Jews, and Negroes. For this reason I have been waging an almost lone battle in the House with the idea of getting the House Un-American Activities Committee to adopt adequate rules of procedure. I started this in the last Congress and continued it in this Congress by introducing on opening day, House Joint Resolution 20, which calls for a joint Senate-House investigating committee and which incorporates the rules of procedure to protect the livelihoods and reputations of innocent people as recommended by the bar association of the city of New York.

Recently the Senator from Massachusetts, Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, has come to substantially the same conclusions to which I had come and recommended almost the same remedy. The very successful Canadian spy investigation by a Royal Commission a few years ago following exactly this procedure certainly bears this out. In order to keep my position intact, with respect to this question of reform of procedure and of protection of individual rights, I have had to withhold my support from the appropriation for the existing House committee. I believe that with the increased emphasis on reform of such procedure, the necessity for withholding such support on my part will soon be ended.

It is absolutely essential that the people have the facts which have been brought out in the current investigation on subversives in the State Department and elsewhere, and that every inquiry be pursued to the end so that a final result may be arrived at and all the facts developed for the American people. This can be done consistent with our freedoms.

I have reported above on the progress of the FEPC bill and on legislation against discrimination and segregation in education. Antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation have been relatively overlooked by the Congress in view of the FEPC fight. However, we cannot rest until all of our citizens without exception and without segregation enjoy their full rights and freedoms as Americans of the same class.

FOOD PRICES

The work which I started last year of opposition to the inflexible 90-percent

parity farm prices, which is helping to keep food prices up, is beginning to show progress. The shocking experience of the potato price-support program resulting in an expenditure estimated at over several hundred million dollars to date, and the piling up and wasting of 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes this year, has sunk into the consciousness of most Americans.

Opposition to these programs beginning from the time when I was one of only 25 who voted against the high farm price parity bill last year has been mounting. On a recent vote on the bill to expand cotton and peanut acreage, likely to pile up more surpluses, this opposition rose to 155 negative votes in the House.

An effort to write into the European recovery program recently provisions which would further increase farm prices was stricken out by the House of Representatives without even a record vote. These are signs of the times.

High Government supports for farm prices bear unfairly on the living costs of city consumers; they are also unwise for the farmer who does not want a reaction to set in which may swing the pendulum too far the other way.

It is very much in the interest of city dwellers that agriculture should be prosperous and Government should help with that, but not that farmers should be a favored class.

There is a farm program which can be fair to both, but it is not the one which is law today. The glittering promises made by the administration of low food prices to consumers and high food prices to farmers just cannot stand up, and both city dwellers and farmers are becoming disillusioned. It will interest my constituents to know that the investment in the farm-price-support program on the part of the Federal Government aggregates in direct investment over \$4,000,000,000 and that the cost is running at about \$1,000,000,000 a year. I shall stay in this fight which is so important to the well-being of the country and I believe that we shall make progress at long last and bring food prices within reasonable relation to city incomes while dealing fairly with our farmers.

FOREIGN POLICY

The issue of peace or war continues to dominate the minds and hearts of man in our own as well as in every other country. American foreign policy is founded firmly on the rock of freedom and constitutional government by law—not men. We are determined to win the struggle against the totalitarian ideology of communism whose aim is to enslave all men. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, our district, through me, has had an excellent opportunity to participate in this cold war struggle in an effective way. I spent some time in November and December last in Western Germany, Berlin, Italy, Israel, France and Great Britain with a mission from this committee working on foreign-affairs problems.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC STABILITY

Americans recognize by now that we cannot be prosperous in a bankrupt

world. We recognize also that we cannot be safe in such a world, for peoples who have no hope will flock to communism out of sheer despair, and we may then find that we are isolated rather than isolationist, and face a whole hostile world with the choice either of giving in, or destroying ourselves in a war or in unbelievably large military expenditures. Hence, the billions we invest in international economic stability are primarily invested in the interest of our own security and well-being.

We are continuing the 4-year European recovery program—Marshall plan—this year into its third year with an expenditure which is likely to be about \$2,850,000,000. The first 2 years of ERP were spent in helping our allies in western Europe to recover from the direct ravages of war. The next 2 years of ERP will be spent in building up markets where our allies may sell what they make, and in integrating them economically with each other so that, instead of being 16 nations at economic war, they are 16 nations working together cooperatively much like our own 48 States in economic peace.

It is by now clear that even after 1952, when the European recovery program is due to end, western Europe will still face a serious dollar shortage with which to feed and clothe itself even austere, and get raw materials for its factories. This can be made up by slicing drastically our exports, or it can be made up for by increasing imports from western Europe, and improving western Europe's opportunities to get raw materials in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If we slice our exports drastically, we are heading for a depression of our own making, because we would have to lay off a few million workers engaged in the export industries, and deprive ourselves of an outlet for billions of dollars in surplus manufactured and agricultural products. If we increase imports and build up underdeveloped areas to supply raw materials, we can save ourselves and the world.

Two necessary ingredients at this point are the acceptance by the United States of membership in the International Trade Organization—ITO—which will facilitate trade for all the participating countries, including ourselves; and a vigorous development of the point 4 program to make available American technical skill to develop underdeveloped countries, concentrated in the first instance on agriculture, health, and education.

I fought hard for this point 4 program in the recent legislation for the European recovery program, and it passed the House of Representatives after a very difficult battle. Export of our technical skills is the most economical thing we can do. It will save us hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditure for direct assistance to recovery, while adding to those who benefit from it billions of dollars through their own efforts and their own resources. I intend to continue to work for this program constantly. It is one of the best answers we have to communism and one

of the best ways we have to attain a stable and prosperous world.

THE FAR EAST

Our policy in this area has been bankrupt of vigor and original ideas. The forces of freedom on the whole have suffered losses in this area, the gravest of which is the loss of the mainland of China to the Communists. In the absence of a policy by the Administration the Congress has itself stated a policy, which I have had the honor to have a part in drafting. This policy calls on the peoples who remain free in Asia, southeast Asia and the western Pacific, and this includes as well such areas of China as are still free, Japan, South Korea and the Philippines, to organize themselves in a new program of self-help and mutual cooperation and assures them of our aid if they do.

I fought hard here for assistance to South Korea, one of the sturdy outposts of freedom in Asia which we are honor bound to maintain. A far-eastern policy is in the making. It must be compounded of self-help by the free peoples of the Far East themselves with our aid, and by making it clear that the United States intends to protect and to continue to assist vigorously and effectively all those peoples of the Far East who maintain the desire to be free. I place great reliance in this respect on the people of the great subcontinent of India.

There need be no haste about recognizing Communist China, such as was shown by other nations. It is much too early to judge whether it is anything but a tool of the Soviet Union—another satellite. We must be prepared for great and bold policy in the Far East which need not include speculative military adventures. Our reverses in China have taught us how much the Far East really means to our own security, to the fight against communism and to world peace.

GREEK CHILDREN

The whole world was outraged by news of the abduction of 28,000 children of Greece by the Communist guerrillas for training and indoctrination in countries behind the iron curtain. It is gratifying to be able to report that in cooperation with the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, I was able to get favorable action on a resolution which I introduced and which unanimously passed the House of Representatives condemning in unmeasured terms the brutality of this abduction. This resolution demanding the restoration of these children to their homes strengthened the hands of the President in seeking help on this subject from Yugoslavia and other nations.

NEAR EAST ARMS RACE

A new problem with respect to the establishment of peace and security in the Near East following the Arab-Israeli conflict came to my attention directly as a result of my visit to Israel in December last. It was clear to me that a renewal of this conflict was threatened by the development of an arms race in the Near East brought about by continued and large scale shipments of jet fighter aircraft, tanks,

and gunboats, and other arms capable of use for aggression by Great Britain to Egypt, Iraq, and Jordan and perhaps through them to other Near East states.

When I returned to the United States I vigorously protested this British policy to the Secretary of State. His answer to me impliedly admitting the arms shipments started in train a current of protest from Members of Congress—including the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives—labor unions including the AFL and CIO, and citizens' organizations of all kinds, which is still going on unabated.

I have been constantly pursuing the demands that the United States must use all its influence to make the British stop their help to this arms race and I shall continue to do so; no problem is greater as it affects the future of the new State of Israel. Our own national security which would be involved with any renewal of war in the Near East, is also affected. This British policy jeopardizes, too, the situation of Jerusalem where peace is so essential to the whole Western World concerned as it is with the protection of the holy places.

ARMED SERVICES

Our national security continues to require between \$13,000,000,000 and \$14,000,000,000 annually for its protection. General Eisenhower has pointed out certain defects in our military preparations and has especially emphasized antisubmarine defense. Fortunately the additional amounts required to tighten up these deficiencies is not excessive. Though our military establishment is only one element in our foreign policy of which economic and cultural policy are the other parts, yet our Military Establishment must be effective and adequate to our needs. It must be dominated by modern concepts of security in the atomic age and also follow the traditional American pattern of civilian control.

In an exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of Defense I have emphasized the urgency of securing our own freedoms and our position in the world by eliminating segregation on grounds of race or color in armed forces. I introduced House Resolution 328, seeking an investigation of such practices of segregation which persist, and urged an amendment to any renewal of the draft law to that effect in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee.

IRELAND

In an effort to focus attention on the problems of Irish partition, I introduced House Resolution 456, seeking a plebiscite under United Nations auspices of all Ireland so that the will of its people to end partition could be manifested and Ireland could join the Atlantic pact nations and be admitted to the United Nations. In the course of the debate on the European recovery program and the amendment on this subject offered by the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, I was able to bring about assurance that hearings would be promptly held on the resolutions which would put the House of Representatives on record as favoring the unification of all Ireland. Such hearings have now been held, and I am hope-

ful of favorable action on such a resolution.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The last few months have seen the United States decision to manufacture the H-bomb. The seriousness of this decision cannot be overemphasized. It puts the greatest pressure upon all nations to bring about an agreement which will give the United Nations the power to keep the peace and as the first step adopt the plan, as requested by the United States and the great majority of UN members, for control and inspection of A-bomb materials and manufacture.

The Soviet walk-out from the Security Council over the failure to seat Communist China has greatly complicated the UN problems. We must remain serene and yet determined in the face of this threat and go about the business of the United Nations anyhow. The United Nations' Secretary General has spoken of a 20-year peace plan. It may be 20 years and we must have the courage and patience to see it through—it will still be infinitely better than war. The ultimate goal which promises peace in this dangerous world is the development of the United Nations itself into a world federation with necessary powers and with adequate forces to keep the peace.

GERMANY

I have long recognized this as the principal area in the struggle in the cold war. It is now becoming clear that the Communists in the eastern zone of Germany will use the ex-Nazis of the western zone which we and the French and British occupy, and hold out the bait of the unification of the eastern and western zones and the return of Germany's eastern provinces, in order to make of a united Germany a new Soviet satellite.

As a member of the European Study Mission of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I spent several weeks studying the situation in western Germany in November and December last. I came away convinced that if we do not plan for a long-term occupation of western Germany, if we do not, with determination, fight against the recurrence of ex-Nazis and ultra-nationalists in high places in government, business, and society there, and if we do not reform the educational system and insist on democratic procedures in all levels of government and society, we will be encouraging a new Germany as aggressive a menace to humanity as before and this time in a league with the Soviet Union which may well be successful in overpowering the civilized world. I have called unceasing attention to these dangers and will continue to do so. I have helped to organize the introduction in the House of Representatives of the same resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator GILLETTE, of Iowa, Senator IVES, of New York, and others seeking a Presidential commission to investigate the whole German situation and our occupation policy there.

I have vigorously opposed and will continue to oppose the remilitarization of Western Germany. The hope for Germany and the hope for peace in Europe

is a federation of western Europe, of which Western Germany can be a part, and in this way to make of all the other Europeans, guarantors of a new Germany's peaceful intentions.

DISPLACED PERSONS

The new displaced-persons legislation now passed by the Senate and House, liberalizes the definition of those eligible and eliminates many of the discriminatory provisions found in the previous law. As soon as a few conflicting Senate and House provisions are ironed out in conference it will undoubtedly be signed by the President. Provisions are made for the admittance of 344,000 displaced persons in 3 years instead of the present 205,000 in 2 years, 20,000 may be orphans admitted for purposes of adoption—legislation which, with Senator IVES, of New York, I pioneered in 1947—4,000 may be anti-Communist refugees stranded in China—a provision which I initiated together with Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York; 18,000 may be veterans who fought under the flag of the Polish Republic and cannot return to their Communist-dominated homeland; 10,000 may be natives of Greece made homeless by the military operations of first the Nazis and later the Communist guerrillas; 5,000 may be from Trieste; and 5,000 may be eligible displaced orphans. The measure gives preference to skilled workers in trades still badly needed to strengthen American industry. The passage by the Senate of so liberal a displaced-persons bill is very gratifying to me, as it is a measure for which I have been fighting since I first came to Congress in 1947. It will be recalled that I was a member of the first congressional committee to investigate the displaced-persons situation in Europe in 1947.

CONCLUSION

From the above it can be seen that our problems are vastly expanded in magnitude and complexity and that the world leadership which our power and resources have forced on us has enormously increased our responsibilities. The American people continue as always to want only peace, freedom, and the practice of the golden rule for themselves and others. This continues to be our greatest strength. Attention has been focused too on the part which our political system must play in these great endeavors, and I have necessarily been concerned in view of the critical importance in our national life of the two-party system with strengthening the hands of progressivism in domestic and especially in foreign affairs in the Republican Party. I have valued, too, the fact that I am elected also by the Liberal Party and this has given me the opportunity for that political independence which is of such great importance to the people of my district. Just as the minds and abilities of Americans are expanding to meet our new challenges, so I believe too that we will find our political institutions doing the same thing.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HOW MUCH IDLE POWER IN THE MERRIMACK AND CONNECTICUT RIVERS?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the managers on the part of the House of the committee on conference of the Committee on Public Works have agreed to the Senate amendment of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill to provide for a power survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries in New England.

Under H. R. 5472, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to make an engineering study of these industrial rivers and tell us how much of its energy is unemployed.

And I say: "It's about time."

American industry was born in New England. This region has had its periods of expansion followed by leveling-off intervals before the advance was resumed.

Today, as always, we look ahead. Following the advice of that good merchant, Lincoln Filene, of Boston, we are determined to build a balanced economy that will make for steady growth.

New England must concentrate on greater diversification. We must attract a variety of new, small industries. To do this we must be able to offer an abundance of low-cost hydroelectric power.

H. R. 5472 gives us hope that the Congress will help us to reach this objective.

Over the years, hundreds of millions of dollars in tax money have been taken from New England to develop public projects in other sections of the Nation. We have been willing to make this contribution to the over-all progress of the United States. Now that those undeveloped areas are thriving, we ask that they have some consideration for the problems of their benefactor—New England.

The President has focused attention on the need for the utilization of water-power resources in the Northeast. Members of both parties from Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut are living up in support of it.

Here is the central problem. We have been suffering from a serious power shortage since 1946. The high cost of available power ties up farmers and industrial users alike. It is preventing them from making full use of electric service in this postwar era of expansion, and puts them under a competitive handicap.

New England labors under the burden of the highest power rates in the Nation. The reports of the Federal Power Commission back up this statement with documentary proof.

We have the water-power resources. But not the full and effective employment of them.

The limited and inefficient techniques which were sufficient in the past, do not measure up to the needs of the present.

The six States cannot do the job alone. Neither can private industry because the whole question of a river basin and its coordinated development is one in which the public interest is paramount. Only the Federal Government has the means

and the authority to initiate a complete program that will not bog down in contradictions.

I do not hear the communities or the States within the Tennessee Valley basin complaining that their sovereign rights have been usurped by the TVA. Because that progressive and successful project has proved its worth beyond criticism.

What has stimulated the growth of economic enterprise in the valley of the Tennessee, can do the same for other regions.

Change is the law of life. It must be guided, not obstructed.

Our own form of Government is not committed to the maintenance of a rigid status quo. Its success is rooted in its flexibility, its ability to evolve with the times and effectively serve new needs.

When the motorcar was invented, we did not forbid its manufacture for fear that it would endanger the established manufacturers of whips, harness, and buggies. To do so would thwart progress.

Likewise, we of the present do not close our eyes to the fact that private producers of power just cannot do the job of integrating the development of a river basin, which is beyond their scope in the first place.

The only alternative they suggest is that we stay as we are.

This negative attitude has been overruled by the Supreme Court of the United States which has decided that the Federal Government has full power and authority over all navigable streams and that Federal control of navigable streams extends to the entire basin.

The elimination of pollution, the control of floods, the development of hydroelectric power and incidental benefits cannot be handled by individual States, or on an isolated basis, with each phase of the problem separated from the others.

In H. R. 5472 we find the first realistic step toward searching out the facts on the hydroelectric potential of the Merrimack River which courses through New Hampshire and northeastern Massachusetts.

I am confident that the findings will be implemented by further positive action to boost the economy of New England.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] on his very effective speech. His address is most appropriate. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has been a leader in the fight for the development of the resources of New England which are now wasted and which have been wasted for a long time. Unfortunately in the past, due to the opposition of States in New England, the advancement and progress which this survey represents has been held back. We are very thankful to President Truman for the recommendation he made in connection with the New England situation and the development of our national resources which are going to waste and which could be utilized in the interest of business generally and of the people of New England.

Throughout the years that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has been a Member of this body he has been advocating the very thing that President Truman so effectively recommended to the Congress and which has brought about the inclusion of that recommendation in the conference report on the Rivers and Harbors bill which will come before us tomorrow.

Mr. LANE. I thank our distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Boston, for his contribution with respect to this matter and for the remarks that he has just made. I know over the years the majority leader has been one of the outspoken advocates of this policy. He has been joined by the Governor of our Commonwealth on many occasions and he has spoken not only here on the floor of the House but publicly in the State of Massachusetts to further the interests of the Government of the United States in taking over these rivers to see if we cannot develop them to obtain further power projects for New England to help our business and industries in that section of the country.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS BUTTER

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I received this afternoon advice that the Production and Marketing Administration has been providing surplus butter in rather substantial quantities to 29 States. This led to an inquiry addressed to the Distribution Division, and I am now advised that since April 14, as of this morning, there has been distribution under section 416 of a total of 3,426,800 pounds. This is further clear recognition of the basic soundness of the proposal I have repeatedly made that these food commodities should be distributed to needy people to avoid spoilage and to eliminate the wholly unjustifiable waste of Federal funds in their storage. I only hope that the program can be stepped up and that this evidence of a belated recognition of the soundness of the proposals I have made will become the official policy of the executive department.

However, I am puzzled by the facts which have been reported to me. I am including here a breakdown of the distribution of this butter in 29 States. I think all Members will be interested to note that 43 percent, or 1,473,760 pounds, have been distributed in Illinois, against the total of 1,953,040 in the other 28 States. I think my colleagues from Illinois may also be interested in this development.

Distribution of butter since April 14 under section 416 as of May 2, 1950:

	Pounds
Alabama.....	1,216
Arkansas.....	26,432
California.....	54,400
Colorado.....	24,000
Florida.....	20,032
Georgia.....	50,816
Idaho.....	128

	Pounds
Illinois.....	1,473,760
Iowa.....	13,056
Kansas.....	64,128
Kentucky.....	55,296
Louisiana.....	72,000
Maryland.....	32,640
Massachusetts.....	147,840
Michigan.....	183,232
Minnesota.....	119,040
Missouri.....	72,960
Nevada.....	1,920
New Hampshire.....	35,200
New Jersey.....	132,800
New York.....	376,768
Oregon.....	512
Pennsylvania.....	205,824
Rhode Island.....	21,120
Tennessee.....	40,464
Utah.....	21,120
Virginia.....	21,120
Washington.....	74,496
West Virginia.....	84,480
Total.....	3,426,800

According to the best information I can get, this butter is going to relief agencies.

The more I think about it the more I question that 43 percent of all the needy people are located in one State with 57 percent in 28 other States, and no one in need of butter in 19 States. Quite probably there is an explanation, and I would be interested in having it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. TABER) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech he made.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, on April 29 I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$273, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article on the late Generoso Pope.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a poem.

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Evening Sentinel of Shenandoah, Iowa, by Mr. David Archie entitled "Off the Cuff," and a copy of a letter he wrote to a friend.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution and statement introduced today by a bipartisan group of Members seeking the appointment of a

Presidential commission for the investigation of a situation in Germany, as was recently done in the other body.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; and

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2919. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Paul High Horse and Anna High Horse;

H. R. 5609. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to B. M. (Bud) Phelps;

H. R. 5610. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Emma Phelps Glenn;

H. R. 5611. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Charles M. Phelps;

H. R. 5860. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell the land of Frank Phelps under existing regulations; and

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1422. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$2,191,000 for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 577); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1423. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal home-loan banks and the Home Loan Bank Board for

the year ended June 30, 1949, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 857) (H. Doc. No. 578); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

1424. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 8, 1950, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Quillayute River, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 30, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 579); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

1425. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted by the tribal business council of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1426. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enable the governments of Alaska, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, and of the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and low-rent housing activities, including the issuance of bonds and other obligations, to amend the low-rent housing enabling statutes for Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1427. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Mary Leila Forrest, nee Jackson, No. A-6988009 CR 27429, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 572. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5074, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1972). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7764. A bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Resolution 546. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5; without amendment (Rept. No. 1976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 187. Concurrent resolution favoring the grant of status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1973).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart, with amendment (Rept. No. 1974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 8318. A bill to prohibit the transportation or importation of any goods, wares, or merchandise manufactured, produced, or mined by any person, firm, or corporation who has refused to bargain collectively, fairly, and in good faith with employees or who indulges in any unfair labor practices; prohibition against same; penalty for violating the act; and exceptions to the scope of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 8319. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8320. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agriculture commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 8321. A bill to incorporate the National Sheriffs' Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8322. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building or buildings in or near the city of Baltimore, Md., for the use and accommodation of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8323. A bill to authorize the exchange of wildlife refuge lands within the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 8324. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide the maximum retirement pay for certain retired enlisted men for the period from July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8325. A bill authorizing the Shilshole Bay breakwater project, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8326. A bill to remove certain restrictions with respect to clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8327. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Fuel Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Concurrent Resolution 199; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Res. 573. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of flood conditions in the Red River of the North drainage basin; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 574. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 573; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 575. Resolution for the improvement of rural delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 576. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 577. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7764, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Res. 578. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 579. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 580. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 581. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission to study and report on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 582. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. Res. 583. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 584. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 585. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. Res. 586. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, requesting the enactment of legislation for a national and comprehensive pension program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8328. A bill for the relief of John Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 8329. A bill for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8330. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Duran Cue-

vas de Thomasa, and his child Jose Maria Thomasa Duran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8331. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 8332. A bill for the relief of Elena Bohdenecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. R. 8333. A bill for the relief of S. Francis Liu and Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 8334. A bill for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8335. A bill for the relief of Dr. L. W. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 8336. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Mirena Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 8337. A bill for the relief of William A. Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2100. Mr. FORAND presented a resolution of the City Council of Providence, R. I., petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to enact without delay such legislation as may be needed to continue Federal control of rents until such time as the current housing shortage may be eased, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, high over all, blessed forever, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, the round ocean, the living air, the blue sky, and in the mind of man, we lift our hearts to Thee. Thou makest Thyself known in the stillness. May we become aware of Thy healing presence in this hallowed moment. Grant us to rise on stepping stones of our dead selves to finer and better things. Nourish within us a divine discontent, that we may be restless among the things that spoil the music of our common humanity. Plant a cross in our hearts and let it burn out all vanity and pride. Set us apart to be builders of a better world, architects of nobler international relationships.

Thou hast shown us, O Lord, what is good. Enable us to perform what Thou dost require, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Jour-

nal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

NOTICE OF VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, tomorrow the Prime Minister of Pakistan and a party of 10 will arrive at the Capitol around noon. They will be escorted to the Vice President's office, and later the Prime Minister will appear before the Senate to address the Members thereof. I make the announcement now in the hope that all Senators will be present at the time the Prime Minister appears, which, I repeat, will be 12 o'clock.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for 1 week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to conduct a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DISLOYALTY CHARGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the subcommittee investigating disloyalty charges in the State Department is now accumulating quite a number of witnesses. I have been tied up in the mornings, the afternoons, and some evenings in the hearings. The witnesses are becoming restive because we cannot place them on the stand promptly, and in many cases they have to be here a week at a time before we can call them.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that we are going into some phases of the matter which have not been currently heard by the committee, I shall have to ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be allowed to sit at such times as necessary during the sessions of the Senate in order to dispose of these witnesses. We have accumulated such a backlog of work that unless we are given this right, we could not possibly hear and determine the issues which are involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.